

CHRISTENDOM

VOLUME XI

AUTUMN, 1946

NUMBER 4

CHRIST HIMSELF THE AUTHOR OF UNITY

By W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

I

WHAT does it mean to believe that Jesus Christ himself is the *auctor unitatis*? It means that we are not to construct a unity which does not yet exist but to render witness to that unity which he gives.

In his opening sermon at the Edinburgh Conference, Archbishop Temple said:

Our faith must be more than the trust which leads us to rely on Him. It must be the deeper faith which leads us to wait for Him. It is not we who can heal the wounds of His Body. We confer and deliberate, and that is right. But it is not by contrivance and adjustment that we can unite the Church of God. It is only by coming closer to Him that we come nearer to one another . . . Only when God has drawn us closer to Himself shall we be truly united together; and then our task will be, *not to consummate our endeavour but to register His achievement.*

In the context of our problem the last words are particularly important. Church unity is not a matter of organization; it is not produced when men suddenly begin to desire it and work for it; it is a gift which God gives and to which the Church renders witness.

Karl Barth puts the same truth in another way. He says, "All efforts toward unity depend wholly on an act of recognition by the Church," and he explains what this means as follows:

Not the recognition: "It would be fine if we had unity today"; but the recognition: "It is God's Will that today such unity is realized." There exists a heavenly unity which must now become visible on earth. And since this is His Will, we must obediently do our share, so that we do not contradict on earth what is God's will in heaven. (*Evangelische Theologie*, April, 1935.)

Unity is *discovered*, but that does not mean that men's role is purely passive. We are to look out for it and to be constantly ready to receive it. And that can only mean that we put ourselves in such a position that the unity which is given to us becomes visible and effective in our midst.

The true way out of our dilemma is, therefore, to consider the World Council as a means to manifest the unity of the Church, whenever and wherever the Lord of the Church himself gives that unity. To quote again Archbishop Temple, the World Council is "a method whereby the *Una Sancta* will be provided with a more permanent and more effectual means of declaring itself and its judgment than at any time for four hundred, perhaps for eight hundred years." (*Edinburgh Report*, p. 20.) A *means* and a *method* and no more. The World Council is not the *Una Sancta*. But a means and a method which have no other *raison d'être* than to be used by the *Una Sancta*. And therefore, far more than a movement *about* unity and far more than an organizational innovation.

The World Council must, therefore, not pretend that it represents the *Una Sancta*, but it may and it must claim that it is a body in which and through which, when it pleases God, the *Una Sancta* becomes manifest. As an institution, it has no authority, not even as much authority as its member churches which can take their stand on the basis of their respective confessions of faith and whose authority within their own sphere of action is unchallenged. From a horizontal viewpoint it remains a loose federation of dissimilar churches, which disagree about fundamental matters of faith, order, and ethics. But from a vertical viewpoint, it is the place where the *koinonia* in the one faith may become (and has become) at least partly visible. When that happens, when the "organization" called World Council of Churches becomes the *Una Sancta*, then indeed it has true authority. Then the confusion of tongues ceases for a moment and the disunity of the given churches is overshadowed by the essential unity of the Church of Christ.

Who shall say when this is the case? Certainly not the World Council itself. For as we have seen, it can only try to express the mind of the *Una Sancta* but not claim to *be* the *Una Sancta*. It is rather up to any member church and indeed to every church member to decide whether, in each given case, it recognizes in the World Council a manifestation of the one Body which fulfils the will of the Head.

It is, therefore, quite in order that in its Constitution the World Council does not claim any authority for itself. The explanatory Memorandum says on this point: "Its Assembly and Central Committee will have no constitutional authority over its constituent churches. Any authority that it (the World Council) may have, will consist in the weight which it carries with the churches by its own wisdom."

But that does not mean that the World Council should not take itself seriously and that it should act as a merely human organization. While it carries no canonical authority, it may, *Deo volente*, suddenly take on the formidable authority of an organ of the Holy Spirit.

Its whole life must be a constant counting with that possibility and a constant watching for that intervention from above. If it lives in that attitude, it will not become a mere ecclesiastical bureaucracy and will have true relevance for the life of the churches.

II

Implications of World Council Membership. What does it mean for a church to become a member of this World Council? It follows from the above that the acceptance of membership is not merely a matter of practical strategy. It amounts to more than the decision to strengthen the common front of the churches and to collaborate in practical tasks. It is not sufficiently explained as a readiness to study and discuss the prospects of reunion. To enter into the World Council means to join in the search for the Church in the churches and to be ready to participate in its manifestation whenever and wherever that manifestation is being granted.

But the search for the Church in the churches begins at home. To take the *Una Sancta* seriously is to subject oneself to its critique. Now that critique takes the form of an ecumenical traffic in which each church is questioned by its sister churches. Where such questioning does not take place because of an excess of politeness and of sensitiveness, we are no longer in the truly ecumenical situation but in the political or secular sphere.

Churches searching for the Church in the churches question each other about their faith, not merely their faith on paper, but their faith as it finds expression in witness and decisions. They exhort each other to greater faithfulness and to renewal of life. They call each other back to the Bible. If the World Council should do nothing else but to set in motion this process of constructive and mutual challenge,

so that the churches cease to be on the defensive toward each other, that they stop behaving as rival parties and that they let themselves be transformed in the give and take of a common battle for the truth of God — that alone would justify its existence.

A common *battle!* Membership in the World Council is or ought to be a costly affair. Alexandre Vinet has said: "Living unity is a peace concluded on a battlefield on which the vanquished becomes the ally of the victor, believes that he triumphs, and becomes indeed victorious." (*Manifestation des convictions religieuses*, p. 50.) Ecumenical relations, just because they tend to a higher peace, can never know the peace which is the result of defeatism and indifference to truth.

But the purpose of it all is the healing of the Church. The ecumenical fellowship is not only a battlefield; it is also a hospital. All churches are sick. All need the same doctor. As they recognize their sickness and turn to him the healing has already begun. There is no stronger ecumenical bond than this common dependence upon the Head of the Body who restores the Body to health.

III

Can the World Council Speak? The *koinonia* of members of the one Body is, according to the New Testament, not only a fellowship in worship but also and especially a fellowship in witness. When, therefore, the disunited churches decide to meet together, they must seek to render a common witness to the world. The churches in the World Council have agreed to meet on the basis that Jesus Christ is God and Saviour. The meaning of that affirmation is surely that he is Lord in the radical and absolute sense which the New Testament gives to that word. But that Lordship demands to be proclaimed in relation to all voices and forces which deny it in word or deed. The demand that the churches as gathered together in the World Council should speak out and take a clear stand in relation to the heresies and idolatries, the crimes and temptations of our chaotic age, comes with all the more insistence now that a number of churches have, after a very long period of silence, realized again that the Church has a prophetic ministry to perform. This insight must permeate the whole ecumenical Church. The churches of and in the World Council ought to say together and in terms of the world situation what the witnessing churches are attempting to say in their national situations. The world

needs more badly than ever to hear a clear united voice which confronts it with the reality of God's judgment and God's grace.

But though it is clear that the churches *ought* to speak together, it is not so clear that they *can* speak together. The particular churches speak on the basis of their confessions and (or) their confessional theologies. Their witness is an application of all that their members have heard and learned in their common confrontation with the revelation. Within these churches there may be considerable divergences and tensions, but there are nevertheless common "traditions" which enable each of them to speak in one voice.

Now the World Council has no such background. It has nothing but its basis, which is interpreted in different and contradictory ways. It has no common spiritual language. The very meaning of witness and confession is understood differently by different churches. And while they are all at one in recognizing the authority of Holy Scripture, there are deep divergences between them as to the actual significance of that authority for the life of the Church. Dare the World Council speak as long as it has to stand on so uncertain a foundation? Should it make a desperate attempt to speak in spite of these disagreements or should it first concentrate itself on the task of fostering unity within its own ranks?

Before we answer that question we have to look at another aspect of the problem, namely: Who is to speak *as* or *for* the World Council? As we have seen, the World Council is not a union, not even a federal union of churches. It is only a federation for specific purposes and with strictly limited authority. It consists of churches which are opposed to any delegation of power to officers of an ecumenical body — some because they are against all hierarchical forms of church order, others because they believe that such an order can only exist in fullness in a truly reunited church. It is, therefore, out of the question that one person (as in the case of the Pope) or a group of persons (as in the case of many episcopal and presbyterian churches) should speak officially on its behalf. When Archbishop Temple said at the Oxford Conference that the Council "will confer upon the Church of Christ an organ which it so sorely needs to speak unitedly to the world in the name of non-Roman Christendom," a strongly adverse reaction was expressed in various quarters.

This is not merely a matter of canonical law. It is an inevitable con-

sequence of the present situation. For every one of the officers of the Council is a churchman who stands somewhere in one of the particular churches. Not one of them is a supra-confessional person. Every one of them represents *a* voice *in* the Council rather than *the* voice *of* the Council. And even if one of them should try to speak for it, no one who knows the realities of the ecumenical situation could possibly take his voice as the voice of the fellowship as a whole.

The churches in the World Council believe practically without exception that the voice of the Church is to express itself through representative bodies. This is *a fortiori* true for the World Council. But in its case the only truly representative body is the Assembly, in which practically all the member churches are represented, and which can only meet at very rare occasions. All other World Council bodies are unrepresentative, for they include only a fraction of the member churches, and none of these churches has authorized these bodies to speak for them.

These are by no means merely technical subtleties. Such very real obstacles are part and parcel of the impossible situation which the churches have allowed to develop and for which they must now pay the heavy price. To ignore their existence is simply to create an ecumenical movement which is a castle in the air.

But if the World Council is neither spiritually nor legally entitled to speak out, should it then remain silent? At this point we have to remember the paradoxical character of the World Council. If the World Council looks introspectively at its own situation, it cannot possibly speak. For it will then become obsessed by the difficulties of its own internal life and postpone the days of witness *ad calendas Graecas*. But if it remembers that it is not merely an organization which has to count with the empirical realities of its own life, but that it is an instrument offered to the Lord of the Church to be used as he wills — then it will hope for and pray for the miracle to happen that it will be allowed to speak.

A true miracle! For the World Council can only speak if the very heterogeneous group of its leaders is suddenly transformed into a homogeneous fellowship of witness. The many individual voices which speak from somewhere in the divided church must become the common voice which speaks from the centre of the one and undivided Church. A miracle — and therefore not something to be forced but

something to be received. It does not help the Church or the world to present a common front if there is no substantial unity behind it.

Dr. Kraemer has written about the common speaking of the churches: "To learn to speak in unison is like seeking for a straight path through the wilderness." But then, if we truly seek for that path, we may find to our surprise that it has already been prepared for us. There have been moments in the history of the ecumenical movement when a word has been given to a company of men who found in their own situation little or no reason to expect it.

What is the weight of such a common word? It cannot commit the churches in the World Council. It carries no official character. It is in many ways a defenceless utterance which may be challenged from almost any quarter. It is simply the word of men who say: "We have no canonical authority. We have no right to speak for all the Christian churches, not even all non-Roman Christian churches. But we are leaders of a council in and through which the churches seek to reestablish the *koinonia* which they had lost. We cannot, therefore, refrain from praying and working for the manifestation of that *koinonia*. And we cannot remain silent when God answers our prayers and gives us a word of common witness. It is up to each church to decide whether it recognizes the genuine voice of the *Una Sancta* in our witness."

The World Council must then always be ready to be used as the voice of the *Una Sancta*. And it must prepare itself for this task by eliminating all conditions which keep it from witnessing and which are in its power to eliminate. Thus it must get rid of all fear of the political and organizational consequences of a clear witness and many other human, all too human, considerations. It must make a desperate attempt to speak out whenever there arises an issue of decisive moment for the cause of the Church in the world. Very often it will fail. In the future, as on several occasions in the past, it will happen again and again that, though there is a willingness to speak, no agreement can be reached as to the content of the message to be proclaimed. And, if it does speak, it will have to be ready to meet with severe criticism and to be repudiated as a voice which does not represent the conviction of the churches. All that is inevitable and belongs to the risks of the ecumenical adventure.

Everything depends finally on the fundamental readiness to be used. If the World Council refuses to act as the organ of the *Una Sancta*, it

has no promise. But if it is fundamentally willing to be used, even its failures will finally prove to be blessings.

IV

The Task of "Confessing" Churches and Movements. All that we have said shows that, while we must not cease to demand that the World Council should render a clear witness, we cannot expect in the present ecumenical situation that it will do so as often as it should or as definitely as it should. It will take a long time before the heavy mortgage of the long period of estrangement and of common silence has been paid off and before the churches in and through the World Council will be able to speak together on the basis of their fundamental agreement rather than in spite of their deep disagreements. There will arise decisive questions on which the World Council will be unable to speak, because its leaders and member churches are unable to arrive at a common mind about them.

In these circumstances the question arises whether those churches which take their stand on a more clearly defined common foundation, and which believe that the voice of the churches should make itself heard, are not obliged to get together so as to be able to speak out together, when the World Council is unable to do so. Our answer is that in spite of all difficulties and complications that may arise in this manner, these churches should feel quite free to do so. The World Council must be sufficiently aware of its own limitations to realize that it dare not hold back those churches which feel constrained to speak and to act together. It should not merely recognize the need for such groupings which are less inclusive, but are based on more substantial agreement. It should rejoice in the fact that through their confession the whole Church of Christ is challenged and increasingly mobilized for concrete prophetic action.

Such confessing bodies would first of all have the task to act as pioneering bodies for the whole ecumenical movement as they render a witness to the world which may later become the witness of the whole ecumenical fellowship. They would act vicariously for the World Council when the World Council is still held back by its inner tensions and ecclesiastical obstacles.

The vital question is, however, whether such groupings, for the sake of a definite common witness, conceive their task as a ministry exercised *for* the churches which are associated in the World Council or as a

manifestation *against* these churches; that is to say, whether theirs is essentially an ecumenical or a separatist action.

This will become clear in very concrete ways. A confessing movement which has a strong sense of mission to the whole world-wide Church must desire that the witness which it believes ought to be rendered, should be rendered by the most inclusive church body, that is by the World Council. It will, therefore, seek to convince the churches in the World Council and the World Council organs of the necessity of rendering this witness. In matters which affect the life of all churches it will not speak unless it has become clear that the World Council is unable or unwilling to speak. It will conceive of itself as an emergency body which should cease to exist as soon as the World Council is ready to take over its task. It may challenge and criticize the World Council, but it will not withdraw into a position of isolation.

It is quite obvious that the existence of such groupings of a confessing character will not simplify the already none too simple ecumenical situation. We believe, nevertheless, that they will be a sign of health. The great danger of the present structure of the ecumenical movement, with its representative character, is that the voice of true prophecy will not be heard sufficiently in its midst. Now the only way of avoiding that danger is to make sure that churches and movements which have a prophetic charism shall feel their responsibility in and to the World Council.

There are many today who believe that the ecumenical movement is increasingly turning from a prophetic into an ecclesiastical movement. That is a mistaken view of its history. For the prophet takes his stand among his people and struggles to save the soul of the whole people of God. The ecumenical movement does not necessarily oust the spirit of prophecy when it seeks to call the churches as such to take the *Una Sancta* seriously. But it is true that the ecumenical movement cannot live without prophecy. For in the last resort the unity of the Church is an eschatological reality. It belongs to the events "which come to pass in the last days," when God will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh. It is a vision which grows dim where the spirit of prophecy is lacking.

V

Post Scriptum. Since the above was written the Provisional Committee of the World Council has met. And it has spoken. It has issued

a "message" and adopted resolutions on some of the most urgent international problems. Does this mean that the question of principle is settled?

Certainly not, for the discussion which took place concerning the "message" showed clearly that the basic problem remains. The discussion was not long enough to go to the root of the matter. But it became again very clear that two conceptions of the Church were being defended. There was agreement that at this particular moment the Provisional Committee should speak, but there was no agreement as to the implications of a common statement and as to the permanent right and duty of the Council to be "the mouthpiece of the Christian conscience."

Some affirmed strongly that an utterance of the Council should not be regarded as an utterance of "the Church." The members did not commit their churches, but spoke simply as a gathering of representatives of many churches. And the fact that the Provisional Committee now spoke did not mean that it considered it as its duty to speak to the world on every significant occasion.

Others however expressed the conviction that an utterance of the World Council should be regarded as an attempt to speak for the whole Church of Christ. And since there was a crying need for the voice of the Christian conscience to be heard, the Council should ask God for a word to the world, whenever there was an opportunity to speak.

Thus the question remains an open one. This is inevitable. For it belongs to the very nature of the Council, that there are in its midst different conceptions of the Church and that none of these is cancelled out or suppressed. But it is also healthy for its life. For thus it will remain in a deeper sense "in process of formation," as it asks the Lord of the Church to guide it from step to step.

PHILIP SCHAFF THE LITURGIST

By SCOTT FRANCIS BRENNER

THE liturgical revival which began in the Reformed Church in the United States a hundred years ago was essentially a doctrinal movement — a revival of Catholic faith and practice as purified by the fires of the Reformation.

Since this liturgical revival began in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, it was commonly known as the Mercersburg Movement. That it was concerned about the externals of common worship there is no denying, but it was not interested in any mere embellishment or in superficial changes or in what is now so often referred to as the enrichment of worship. It was concerned about the faith and about the Church. It was determined to repulse the encroaching forces of New England Puritanism on the one hand and Continental rationalism on the other, and this it would do by unsheathing the Catholic faith of the fathers and of the great reformers as well.

The Mercersburg Movement centered about Philip Schaff. It is true that spade work had been done at Mercersburg by Frederick Augustus Rauch and that John Williamson Nevin was sounding for foundations of rock, but the actual laying of the corner-stone and the "building fitly framed" awaited the master craftsman, Philip Schaff.

I

Schaff had responded to the challenge of the Reformed Church in the United States by terminating a promising career in Germany. He left Berlin after conference with its leading theological minds. He then spent six hectic weeks in England conferring with the religious leaders — The Archbishop of Canterbury, John Frederick Denison Maurice, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, and possibly John Henry Newman. He spent some time with Edward Bouverie Pusey, tangled with him on the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and differed with him on the infallibility of the Church as set over against the historical development of the Church. Pusey and Schaff stood far apart on these issues, but each understood the other, and it was an understanding based not only on mutual respect but upon a deep undercurrent of sympathetic thought. Both were churchmen. True, they held different conceptions of the

Church's development and authority but for both the Church was basic and central.

Schaff had his first glimpse of the new world July 28, 1844. His first Sunday he preached in a Dutch Reformed Church in New York. A few days later he resumed his journey to Mercersburg, stopping at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where the Dutch and German Reformed Churches were in convention. Here Schaff met the man who was to be his chief co-laborer and ardent protagonist, John Williamson Nevin. Here Schaff heard the keynote of the Mercersburg Movement set forth in telling words as Nevin began his sermon on "Catholic Unity." The text was: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." (Ephesians 4:4-6.) Of the Apostle, Nevin pointed out that:

He does not say, Let there be one body and one Spirit, as simply urging Christians to seek such agreement among themselves as might justify this view of their state; but the fact is assumed as already in existence, and is made the ground accordingly of the exhortation that goes before. There is one body and Spirit, and therefore are ye bound to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. The unity of the Church is not something which results first from the thought and purpose of the vast membership, of which it is composed; but on the contrary, it is the ground out of which this membership itself springs, and in which perpetually it stands, and from which it must derive evermore all its harmony, and stability, and activity, and strength. From the beginning, this great truth has dwelt deep in the consciousness of the Christian world. Through all ages, and in all lands, that consciousness has been uttering itself as with one mouth, in the article of the creed *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church*. The Church is one and universal. Her unity is essential to her existence.¹

Thus Nevin had unfurled his faith in "Catholic Unity." A few weeks later Schaff lifted his voice in its behalf in the First Reformed Church at Reading, Pennsylvania. It was his Inaugural Address and he chose as his subject *The Principle of Protestantism as Related to the Present State of the Church*. In it he addressed himself to what he designated "The main question of our time," namely, "concerning the nature of the Church itself, in relation to the world and to single Christians." His conclusion he put in these words:

The Church is the body of Jesus Christ. This expresses her communion with her Head, and also the relation of her members to one another. In the first respect, she is an institution founded by Christ, proceeding from his loins and animated by his spirit, for the glory of God and the salvation of man; through

which alone, as its necessary organ, the revelation of God in Christ becomes effective in the history of the world. Hence out of the Church, as there is no Christianity, there can be no salvation.²

Schaff's inaugural was not soon forgotten. It was indeed a broadside directed against the rationalism of the old world, and the sectarianism, individualism, and subjectivism of the new. Schaff was forthwith accused by some of Puseyism and by others of Romanism. A heresy trial ensued. Nevin came to his defense and Schaff was finally acquitted.

II

So much by way of background for Philip Schaff, the liturgist. Schaff was Church conscious. He could not conceive of salvation outside the Church. Nor could he consider the Church without pivoting his thoughts about the Word of God and the Sacraments of God. God's grace and truth, he was persuaded, are mediated to man through the Church by the Word and Sacraments. This mediation of God's "presence-purpose" is the primary function of the Church, and this function she exercises through her liturgy. It is by means of the Church and her liturgy that the life of God is shared with men, and they are engrafted into Christ as branches into a vine. Or, to change the figure of speech, the liturgy is a kind of Jacob's ladder; it rests upon the earth and reaches into the heavens. Man begins the ascent. God descends. Man is caught up in the "presence-purpose" of God as revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord. Schaff's conception of the liturgy did not differ greatly from that view expressed by a modern Roman Catholic liturgist when he reminds us: "The liturgy is to apply through all time the fruits of redemption which Christ made possible for all men by his personal suffering and death, by his personal sacrifice on Calvary."³

During the months which followed his inaugural address Schaff spent most of his time in organizing his theological courses and in introducing the Mercersburg novices to their Catholic heritage in the Reformed faith. Meanwhile Nevin began laying down a heavy barrage with his pen so as to consolidate the advanced positions taken at Harrisburg and Reading and to advance and to strengthen everywhere the Catholic movement. His *Anxious Bench* attacked the so-called "new measures" with their anti-churchly emotionalism and individualism. In *Antichrist: Or the Spirit of Sect and Schism* he asserted that the real "Anti-Christ" is neither the Pope nor the Church of Rome but the sectarian and schismatic principle rampant in American Protestantism.

In 1846 he published his most important work, *The Mystical Presence, A Vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*.

By this time the Catholic movement was beginning to take root in the Reformed Church, and in 1847 the Classis of East Pennsylvania petitioned the Synod to "print a new edition of the Palatinate Liturgy, or to make arrangements for the preparation of a new liturgy designed to meet more nearly the spirit and genius of the Reformed Church in the United States."⁴

That same year a committee was appointed to study the needs of the Church relative to a new liturgy, and soon after another committee was charged with the responsibility of preparing it. This committee was headed by Nevin, but Schaff was also a member. Nevin, as head of the committee, reported to the Synod in 1850 and 1851 that no progress had been made, and, furthermore, that he had been obliged to conclude that the liturgical movement in the Reformed Church was, at least, premature. For some reason Nevin had suddenly lost much of his liturgical zeal. Indeed, he was so uncertain what course to take that he asked to be excused as chairman of the liturgical committee. His request was granted, and in the autumn of 1851 Philip Schaff took over the chairmanship. Nevin remained a member but henceforth Schaff was the official and actual leader of the liturgical movement within the Reformed Church.

III

With Schaff at its head the committee went to work in earnest. That same year in the month of November he took his pen in hand and began writing the new liturgy. But the work was not easy and Schaff was handicapped by a committee that was not of one mind. The Catholic party was duly represented but there were others who were skeptical and one or two who were openly hostile, and in time the committee of eleven found itself sharply divided. The majority backed Schaff while the minority began to advocate a return to the Palatinate Liturgy that once was widely used in the Church — a liturgy that is hortatory, didactic, prosy, and generally wanting in the language of devotion. In this difficult situation Schaff's first undertaking was to persuade the committee to survey the field and to find common ground which would serve as a fulcrum for its work. By the time the Synod met at Baltimore in 1852 Schaff was able to report the findings of the committee. These

Baltimore Resolutions, as they are called, are of the greatest importance because they became the basis of all future work within the committee and because, as the writer believes, they might well be a guide for the recovery of liturgical and ecumenical worship throughout the whole Church. Our chief interest in them at the moment, however, is the fact that they mirror the mind of Philip Schaff, the liturgist. While they are signed by the entire membership of the committee, which by the way is rather surprising, it is Schaff's signature that heads the list and there is every reason to believe that he managed to draft them and that they set forth his matured and settled convictions. The "Resolutions" are as follows:

1. The liturgical worship of the Primitive Church, as far as it can be ascertained from the Holy Scriptures, the oldest ecclesiastical writings, and the liturgies of the Greek and Latin Churches of the third and fourth centuries, ought to be made, as much as possible, the general basis of the proposed liturgy; the more so, as they are in fact also the source from which the best portions of the various liturgies of the sixteenth century were derived, such as the forms of confession and absolution, the litanies, the creeds, the *Te Deum*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the collects, the doxologies, etc.

2. Among the later liturgies special reference ought to be had to the old Palatinate and other Reformed liturgies of the sixteenth century.

3. Neither the ancient Catholic nor the Reformed liturgies, however, ought to be copied slavishly, but reproduced rather in a free evangelical spirit and adapted to the peculiar wants of our age and denomination.

4. The language and style ought to be throughout scriptural as much as possible; that is, simple, sublime, and devotional, such as we find in the Psalms especially, and in the Lord's Prayer. The doctrinal tone, which predominates too much in most of the Calvinistic Liturgies, ought to be used only within certain limits.⁵

By means of these Resolutions Schaff charted his course, and again and again he returned to them for soundings. To this harbor he hoped to bring at last the good ship, *Ecclesia*. Neither tide nor billow nor tempest could drive him from this course.

Late in the autumn of 1853, taking advantage of a year's leave of absence granted by the Synod, Schaff sailed for Europe. First he visited Scotland. Then he went down to England and called upon Archdeacon Wilberforce, who was soon to go over to the Roman Catholic fold. At Oxford he again saw Pusey and noted that "he does not seem to be shaken in his ecclesiastical position by the defection of Newman." While in England he worshipped in Roman Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian, and Catholic Apostolic Churches.

The Catholic Apostolic Church, commonly known as the Irvingite Church, made a deep impression upon him. Edward Irving (1792-1834), founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church, had earlier been a Scottish Presbyterian minister in London. He was a mystic with pronounced ecstatic leanings and peculiar views in the realm of polity. In 1832 he was deposed from the Presbyterian ministry. Many of his followers stood by him and formed a congregation which later on came under the strongest kind of Catholic influence and leadership. In 1842 they published a liturgy entitled *The Liturgy and Other Divine Offices of the Church*, a noble creation based chiefly upon the ancient *Liturgy of St. James*. One Sunday morning Schaff joined the worshippers in the Catholic Apostolic Church on Gordon Square, London. Concerning that experience he wrote his wife as follows:

Sunday I spent the greater part of the day with the Irvingites. In the morning I found their beautiful Gothic Church in Gordon Square, the first of seven Churches of London, thronged with devout worshippers. The Lord's Supper was administered with great solemnity, an imposing ceremonial, many hundreds communing. They observed the best of order; passing up one aisle, then kneeling and passing down the other aisle. The liturgy is very beautiful. I dined with the angel of the Church, Mr. Heath, meeting his large and amiable family, and have seldom been in a household so adorned with Christian graces. Then at four I attended the service designed for the congregation and at seven the service of the evangelists for outsiders. The service this morning, I believe was the most beautiful and perfect liturgical service I have yet attended.⁶

Schaff's laudatory evaluation of the Catholic Apostolic Eucharist and liturgy must be taken at face value and in nowise discounted. His appraisal was not the response of an emotionalist but the sober judgment of an objective critic. So far as we can discover no other experience in the life of Schaff, the liturgist, was as deep, as permanent, as decisive as that Sunday morning of worship in Gordon Square. It was not a familiar experience that Schaff shared in the Catholic Apostolic Church, and yet the externals of Catholic worship were not entirely new to him. The chancel with its lectern, pulpit, and altar; the bishop in his cope and mitre; the priests in chasuble and full eucharistic dress; the deacons and sub-deacons standing about the altar; the lighted candles, and the omnipresent incense, and the glorious congregational plainsong — all this Schaff had experienced before. But now for the first time it was no longer foreign to him. For the first time he was not an onlooker but a participant. For the first time he had found these Catholic externals related to an evangelical worship that was cor-

porate and eucharistic. For the first time he had joined the whole Church, Catholic and Evangelical, in one great act of common worship, in the worship which the Lord himself commanded. The incense of that hour was to linger with Schaff throughout all the days of his liturgical activity.

Schaff returned to Mercersburg a strengthened man, for he had passed through a great experience — the experience of “the most beautiful and perfect liturgical service.” He returned with copies of the Catholic Apostolic liturgy in his pockets; he also carried it in his heart. Henceforth the work committed to him would be easier. He had happened upon the very thing he was seeking: a liturgy based upon the “worship of the Primitive Church”; a liturgy that had in a limited way the advantage of special reference to the “Reformed liturgies of the sixteenth century”; a liturgy that was of an “evangelical spirit and adapted to the peculiar wants of the age”; a liturgy that needed only to be adjusted to the special requirements of the Reformed Church in the United States, and his work would be done. To be sure the task would not be easy, not for a man like Schaff who would insist upon a critical examination of every word and phrase, upon a throughgoing revision that would really adapt it to people of a very different heritage. His mission would be like that of the glass blower who takes a work of great beauty and plunges it back into the flame until it is a molten mass and then brings it forth and designs and shapes it a second time.

IV

From the year 1853 to 1856 the committee kept at its task. It was not an easy work though the Catholic Apostolic liturgy lay before it and became the basis of its labors. “One great difficulty,” wrote Nevin, “was that the work seemed continually to unsettle and destroy itself. What was done would not stay done; but had all the time to be done over again.” But Schaff, with his endless energy and zeal, goaded the committee almost as a taskmaster of old drove his workmen. Much of the work, however, he did himself. He accepted the most important and difficult undertakings — the Service Preparatory to the Holy Communion and the Eucharistic Service itself.

In the archives of the Historical Society of the Reformed Church in the United States there is a nine-page draft of the Holy Communion Service. It is in Schaff’s handwriting and is labeled “*Communion Ser-*

vice, partly compiled, partly original. P. Schaff." It is the prototype of what is known in the Reformed Church as the *Provisional Liturgy* and is the parent rite of the eucharistic service in the still widely used *Order of Worship*. It is also the basis of "The Order for Holy Communion" in the new *Book of Worship* of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. The original draft by Schaff marks a milepost in liturgical recovery within the Reformed branch of the Church. It has influenced, either directly or indirectly, several of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches in America, and it has left its imprint especially upon worship in the Church of Scotland from whence the healing streams of liturgical recovery now course throughout the world. Judged by any worthy standard it must be regarded as one of the greatest liturgical advances of the post-Reformation period. While it is based upon the Catholic Apostolic liturgy, which in turn is based upon St. James, there are elements derived from the sixteenth-century liturgies, the Palatinaté in particular; and not a few words and phrases are lifted from the Heidelberg Catechism and from the works of John Calvin. Yet, despite the borrowings, it is really a new and distinctive creation. It is as though Schaff seated himself at an organ with the score of the Catholic Apostolic liturgy before him and began to improvise. The improvisation is Schaff's, and it is an organic structure of great power and beauty. At the time of its creation there was nothing comparable in the entire Reformed household of faith.

The great Eucharistic Prayer, the prayer of thanksgiving and blessing, by which the consecration is accomplished, is in the nature of the case the very heart of every liturgy. The Eucharistic Prayer which Schaff composed is of the greatest importance. We will, therefore, quote it in full just as it is in the original draft:

Lift up your hearts!

We lift them up unto the Lord.

Let us give thanks unto our Lord God!

It is meet and right so to do.

It is very meet, right and our bounden duty that we should praise Thee, sing hymns unto Thee and give thanks unto Thee, the Father everlasting, Almighty maker of heaven and earth, and unto Jesus Christ the Son of God, Redeemer of the world, and unto the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the spirit of truth and holiness. To Thee the heaven and the heaven of heavens sing praise; the sun, the moon, and the stars; the earth and the sea and all that is therein; Jerusalem the heavenly assembly, the Church of the first born written in heaven; the

spirits of just men made perfect; the patriarchs and prophets; the martyrs and apostles; angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers; and the many-eyed cherubim and seraphim before Thy throne, singing with a loud voice the triumphal hymn of Thine exalted glory,

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth; heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory.

Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord.

Hosanna in the highest.

All glory be to Christ, who by His precious death on the Cross has wrought out an everlasting salvation to all them that believe, and who has instituted and commanded us to celebrate a perpetual memory of this atoning death and perfect sacrifice, until His second coming. For the same night in which He was betrayed (here the Minister shall take the bread into his hands and break it), He took bread; and after He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat, This is My Body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of Me. In like manner also (here he shall take the cup into his hands) He took the cup after He had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My blood; this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, send down, we beseech Thee, Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these elements, which we now offer unto Thee, and so bless and sanctify them, that we Thy servants may be nourished by the sacred Body and precious Blood of Thy Christ unto life everlasting.

And as thou hast given Thine only Son as a full and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, we here present ourselves in body and soul unto Thee a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable, which is our reasonable service. We are Thine; all that we have is Thine; and of Thine only can we give to Thee. And although we are unworthy to offer unto Thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech Thee, accept this our duty and service, and grant, that remembering the blessed sacrifice of Thy Son, showing forth His death, rejoicing at His resurrection and presence at Thy right hand, and waiting in hope for His glorious second coming, with the whole Church of the redeemed, we may be Thine forever, through Jesus Christ our Lord who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

There are two salient points in this liturgical draft that go far in depicting Schaff, the liturgist. The first is the structural unity of the Eucharistic Prayer. Beginning with the *Sursum Corda* and ending with the doxology and the great congregational *Amen*, the prayer is one prayer. It is the one great prayer of thanksgiving-blessing; it is the prayer of consecration. Schaff rightly held the consecration of the Eucharist to be an act of God in response to the Church's corporate prayer "to bless and sanctify." Man's part, even the celebrant's part in the consecration, is the offering of prayer. The consecration is not

conceived as being effected through the priest's use of a formula. Here Schaff makes a break with the Puseyites of his time and many of the Anglo-Catholics of our time, and, of course, with the Roman Catholic world. At this point he returned to the rationale of the New Testament, to the rationale of the Primitive Church, to the Catholic rationale that obtained everywhere until the unfortunate development, we might better term it mutation, in the medieval Roman Catholic Church. Schaff's return to the truly Catholic and evangelical rationale of consecration will forever mark him as one of the greatest liturgists within the entire Church.

V

However, a question mark must be inserted at this point. Apparently there was some uncertainty in the mind of Schaff concerning the central act in all our worship — the consecration of the Eucharist. He came to the right conclusion in the end but not without confusion of mind. It could hardly have been otherwise. The late medieval Roman Catholic practice of consecration by means of a formula (*Hoc est enim corpus meum*) had scarcely been questioned by the Churches of the Reformation. The Reformed Churches frequently accepted it and the Lutheran Churches in some instances actually perfected it. Almost everywhere the consecration was believed to take place the instant the celebrant recited the Narrative of Institution; the old idea of consecration by corporate prayer and thanksgiving was forgotten. The last strong voice to protest the medieval idea of consecration by formula was that of the Huguenot historian, Matthieu de L'Arroque. But his monumental work the *History of the Eucharist*, printed in French and Dutch and later in English at London in 1684, had been neglected. Consequently it was not easy for Schaff to restore the Eucharist to its primitive rationale. Neither his Anglican nor his Roman Catholic friends were in a position to help him, and contacts with the Eastern Church were not easy. In the original draft of the Eucharistic Prayer Schaff had resorted to Roman Catholic labels and termed the Narrative of Institution "The Consecration"; opposite the Epiclesis he had written the word "Oblation." It appears that he was then not very sure about the rationale of the liturgy. But when he was finally obliged to come to a decision he wrote the entire Eucharistic Prayer as the prayer of consecration and took his stand on the side of the primitive and truly Catholic tradition. Thus Schaff became a pioneer in the

movement for liturgical reform and recovery which is now making its influence felt throughout the whole Church of Christ.

The Oblation in the Schaff draft is also of enduring significance. It follows the Epiclesis and is tinged with the influence of the Catholic Apostolic liturgy. It is not, however, a rewriting of the Irvingite liturgy which at this point is patterned upon the Roman Rite. Here again Schaff broke with Roman Catholic practice and with Anglo-Catholic practice as well, and wrote an oblation that must have had its origin primarily in his own fertile mind. He was unwilling to skip the Oblation, as some of the Reformers had done, merely because its perverted form in the Roman Catholic Church was difficult to bring into line with the evangelical tradition. Here again we come face to face with the genius of the man. He knew that the liturgy demanded an oblation, that sacrifice is the very essence of our faith, and he set his hands to the closing of the breach. He realized that when the Lord commanded "This do for my memorial" he intended that the Eucharist should be a memorial not only before men but also before God the Father. The memorial act in the liturgy is not in memory of a departed friend who must be recalled to mind, an *in memoriam*, but it is a memorial before God the Father; that is to say, it is the basis of the petitions which we direct to God. Because of what Jesus Christ did on Calvary we are bold to "memorialize" God our Father to forgive us our sins, to cause us to walk in the way of holiness, and finally to set our feet in the way of life everlasting. We present to our heavenly Father the memorial of Christ and his cross, his resurrection, his ascension, his coming again in glory, and we add to this memorial oblation the poor sacrifice of our own sinful lives and cast ourselves upon the mercy of God.

It is also to be noted that the Epiclesis and the Oblation presuppose that the real presence of the Lord in the Eucharist is a presence within the entire sacramental action and is not to be thought of as confined to the sacred elements either consecrated or distributed. Consequently in the oblation which Schaff designed we are not content to offer God the gifts of bread and wine, nor to offer unto him the Body and Blood of the Lord as in any manner localized upon the altar, but we offer unto the Father the memorial of Calvary and the eternal sacrifice of the Lord at the Father's "right hand," to which we add the reasonable sacrifice of our own persons. In the oblation Schaff, therefore, enters in a creative manner into the liturgical tradition of the Church.

The Intercessions are not a part of the original draft. Schaff merely

indicates in the margin their proper place in the service and calls the attention of his collaborators to the intercessions in the Catholic Apostolic liturgy. At some later date Schaff perfected the Intercessions and inserted them in the final draft.

Schaff's sublime prayer for "the whole family in heaven and earth" merits special attention. Here again is his boldness to confess the Catholic faith by insisting upon a prayer for the dead as the faithful gather about the Table of the Lord. Its prototype is in the Catholic Apostolic liturgy, but here again Schaff enriched his source material and made it his own. As a rule he found it necessary to sweat the fat out of the verbose Catholic Apostolic liturgy, but, when upon occasion he found it necessary to build up a bony corpus, he had no difficulty in supplying the want. In the Catholic Apostolic liturgy the prayer reads:

And now, heavenly Father, rejoicing in the blessed communion of all thy saints, we remember before thee all those who have departed in the faith. We venerate their memories; we give thanks to thee for thy great mercy and many gifts bestowed upon them, through whom such benefits have come to us in the dispensation of thy gospel. And we pray thee, that of thy great mercy thou wilt keep them in rest and peace, until our common perfecting in bliss in the day of the glorious resurrection. Amen.⁸

See, now, what Schaff did to it:

O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named; we rejoice before Thee in the blessed communion of all Thy saints, wherein Thou givest us also to have part. We praise Thee for the holy fellowship of patriarchs and prophets, apostles and martyrs, and the whole glorious company of the redeemed of all ages, who have died in the Lord, and now live with Him forever more. We give thanks unto Thee for Thy great grace and many gifts bestowed on those who have thus gone before us in the way of salvation, and by whom we are now compassed about, in our Christian course, as a cloud of witnesses looking down upon us from the heavenly world. Enable us to follow their faith, that we may enter at death into their joy; and so abide with them in rest and peace, till both they and we shall reach our common consummation of redemption and bliss in the glorious resurrection of the last day. Amen.⁹

Notice the warmth of this prayer; how immediate it is, how personal. How close and real they are "by whom we are compassed about." Fathom the depth of its peace and its confidence as it breaks forth in thanksgiving. Here is one of the great prayers of all time, and it comes from the inner sanctuary of Schaff's heart. When he speaks of the "cloud of witnesses" he is thinking not only of the blessed saints of all

ages known only unto God, but also of his own little Willie who walked with him in this life only two years and whose innocent form now "daily rises before my soul and calls forth sorrow and tears."

VI

In concluding our survey of Schaff the liturgist, we would call attention to the fact that it was not until the year 1857 — six years after he had become its chairman — that the liturgical committee reported to the Synod of Allentown that they had completed and placed in the hands of the printers *A Liturgy or Order of Christian Worship*. This Liturgy included Schaff's draft of the Holy Communion Service as it emerged after being revised in the committee and apparently worked over by John Williamson Nevin.

The Liturgy had no sooner come off the press than debate and controversy ensued. But it was not Schaff, who more than any other man was responsible for the nature of the Liturgy, who arose to champion it. It was Nevin who came to the front and gave himself to fending the blows; Nevin, the skillful and mighty protagonist, took up the cause. In 1862 he published *The Liturgical Question* and in 1866 *The Vindication of the Liturgy*.

While Schaff held himself aloof from all the literary slugging that for years took place between those in favor of his liturgical work and those who opposed it, he did so not because of any change of mind or of heart. He seemed to feel that his work would in time justify itself and so with all confidence he rested his case. Of one thing he was sure: the Church without the liturgy is impotent. He put it in his own words thus:

Next to the Word of God, which stands in unapproachable majesty far above all human creeds and confessions, fathers and reformers, popes and councils, there are no religious books of greater practical importance and influence than catechisms, hymn books, and liturgies. They shape the moral and religious sentiments in early youth; they feed the devotions in old age; they are the faithful companions of the most solemn hours in the house of God, around the family altar and in the silent closet; they give utterance to the deepest emotions, the purest thoughts, the highest aspirations; they urge to duty and every good work; they comfort in affliction, and point to heaven at the approach of death.¹⁰

Philip Schaff is widely known and revered, but Philip Schaff, the liturgist, is known hardly at all. It is high time that this silence be broken and that Philip Schaff, the liturgist, enter into the glory that is his own, for of him it must be said:

1. He advocated the liturgical way of worship.
2. He acknowledged the Eucharist to be "the inmost sanctuary of the whole Christian worship" and the real presence of the Lord the heart of all corporate worship.
3. He revived the primitive and truly Catholic rationale of common worship whereby God consecrates the Eucharist in response to the corporate prayers of the faithful set forth in the great prayer of thanksgiving-blessing.
4. He had a creative mind which enabled him to cast off idiosyncrasies and to enter into the tradition of the whole Church in such a way as to produce new forms, true both to the temper of his time and to the Catholic heritage of the ages.
5. He possessed the gift of compilation, of using the resources of other men and other ages and of bringing them together into the unity of a new and living organism.
6. He was unquestionably Catholic — a member of the whole Church of Christ. By it he lived; for it he labored; in it he died. Of the Holy Catholic Church he could confess in the words of the Heidelberg Catechism, "I am and forever shall remain a living member of the same."

REFERENCES

1. Nevin, John Williamson, Sermon on "Catholic Unity." See Philip Schaff, *Principles of Protestantism*, p. 194.
2. Schaff, Philip, *Principles of Protestantism*, p. 177.
3. Michel, Dom Virgil, *The Liturgy of the Church*, p. 153.
4. *Acts and Proceedings of Synod, 1847* (German Reformed Church).
5. *Acts and Proceedings of Synod, 1852* (German Reformed Church).
6. Schaff, David S., *The Life of Philip Schaff*, p. 178.
7. Original manuscript in the archives of the Historical Society of the Reformed Church in the United States. These archives are located in the Library of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.
8. *The Liturgy and Other Divine Offices of the Church* (Catholic Apostolic), London, 1928, p. 11.
9. *The Order of Worship of the Reformed Church in the United States* and *The Book of Worship of the Evangelical and Reformed Church*.
10. *The Mercersburg Review*, April 1858.

ONE HOLY, CATHOLIC CHURCH

By HERBERT W. NEWELL

THOSE who believe in, and work for, the ecumenical Church, must face an argument that runs like this: "You optimists who use the old phrases about the Church must bear in mind that, to very many of the most earnest people in the world, the Church has been and is a traitor to humanity. You must not forget what 'the Church' means in a predominant degree in Mexico and Spain and Hungary. It is thought of as the great Fascist stronghold, the chief opponent of the education of the people.

"But you need not go so far afield as that. You Protestants, who so strongly dissociate yourselves from these ways, are you anything more than the bourgeoisie? Are you not, in your own way, simply the guardians of the status quo? In the Catholic countries just mentioned the settled order happens to have been the relics of the feudal system. With you the settled order happens to be middle-class. That is the difference. You are equally blind servants of a dying age!"

This type of argument generally goes on to urge us to "come back to Jesus of Nazareth." The true Church (so it is maintained) consists of those who "simply follow him." It is helping the enemy to claim that this thing, the so-called "Church" which has emerged from the past, has, as an organization, any connection with the future. Its destiny is to be extinguished.

It is a striking reflection that, in his heyday, Hitler used to say something like this. Nevertheless it is well to examine, in the light of the undercurrent of uneasiness which many friends of the Ecumenical Movement feel, the argument against the Church which often appeals to those who would be followers of Jesus of Nazareth.

I

We must recollect, to begin with, that the Christian creed has, from the first, put the Church among the transcendent things. Its statement about the Church is exactly on line with its statement about "God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth," and its statement about "Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord." Without any lowering of stress, as of something secondary, the creed goes on, "And I believe in the

holy, catholic Church." This emphasis, found in the oldest creed known, has ample justification from the New Testament. Indeed its roots go back to the earliest beginnings of the Old Testament. In other words, the Christian's thought about the Church, if he is informed on foundation matters, is in the region of *faith*.

"Ah," says our uneasy friend, "here you go again; you escape criticism by the well-known ruse of putting your argument into a cloudy region where your opponent loses touch with you, and the fight is over before it has begun." But this is not an attempt to evade criticism. It is a plain and necessary statement of fact. Faith is, after all, just the word we use for a type of conviction that has its ultimate basis on the revelation of God. It is the leap in the heart of men, as God draws near, itself caused by God's action, to meet him. We have to use such a word as "faith" for this response of the heart, for it is a complex of intellect and emotion, which comes to have an intimate relation with the whole of the believer's life and will, and there is no other word we can use.

We put the Church, then, among the things of mercy that are given to men along with the gift of this "Jesus of Nazareth." In the earliest creed, it is grouped with forgiveness of sins, with the communion of saints, with the life everlasting.

II

But our objector begins to get uneasy again. Are we not trying to run with both hare and hounds, as it were? For a thousand years of tyranny, poor folk in Europe have put their hope in Jesus. He indeed is a "thing of mercy"; but what connection has he with this Church of the last thousand years? We shall be reminded of Dostoievsky's Grand Inquisitor, and what he would like to have done to Jesus, when Jesus stood before him in the prison cell.

It is salutary to remember this, and we will return to the point. It states one set of facts, painful and true. But we maintain that we must begin our thought not there, but in a much more characteristic set of facts, characteristic because they belong to the essential nature of the Church, as a thing of mercy given along with God's revelation in Christ. And to understand the Church, as we understand anything else, we must watch it at its most characteristic activity, which is worship. Let us join the Church at worship. We shall see things there which cannot but fill us with profound emotion, as we think of them against the background of the needs of today.

First of all, we see that the central note of Christian worship is joy and thankfulness. Christ the King is set forth, reigning from his cross. The innermost secret of the universe is broken, like some atomic nucleus, and broken to be the bread and wine of mortal men.

Then we notice that this tremendous mystery is made known through such means as a plain man understands, things of his daily life — a mother and her babe, a craftsman at his bench, words that plain men use with one another, tales such as men tell in their homes after the day's work is over; then it speaks of loneliness, of betrayal, of forgiveness, of death, of new life in the garden at dawn, of the kiss of peace; all this and much more is made known by the means of the daily bread and wine of human intercourse. So at the Christian worship, the gospel of the love of God for men is held up before the believer; and it is so simple that the tired, the illiterate can grasp it; so profound that it never cloy nor wearies. God is drawing near again with his free gift, asking for nothing but a still heart to hear.

In a world which so lacks joy, in a generation used to tawdry, tarnished excitements and unsatisfying aims, where there is much noise and so many lies, can anyone watch but with profound emotion the congregation of the Christian Church adoring Christ the King?

III

But that is not all. This worship is closely related to the deepest needs of life. Watch this congregation as it kneels to make the confession of sin, a sin which is now magnified in its profundity by this very vision of God, which draws all thoughts to itself. Each believer realizes how different from his daily life is this moment of worship. And yet that is the norm of life, life as it should be lived. How little of his life is directed to God; how much of it is directed to self, how much is distorted and causes harm to the plan of things. And sin, once launched, who can see the end of it? "Our manifold sins and wickedness . . . The burden of them is intolerable . . . There is no health in us." Moreover the Christian, kneeling there before Christ the King, with his fellows, knows himself to be a part of the whole sinful order that envelops the world. The building becomes clouded with the age-old misery, the superstition, the ignorance, the unbelief, the pride of men, which enfold us all with the consequences of ill deeds done long since . . . "provoking most justly Thy wrath and indignation against us." These are not light words, nor lightly spoken by the congregation.

We say, and say with all our heart, that mankind must have a place to which it can bring, and where it can express in words, this dreadful sense of the reality of sin, if the evil is not to prey inwardly and drive either to despair or to insensitiveness. And who can say which is the worse alternative?

How gracious, then, and as a voice from heaven, comes the word of forgiveness from the altar — “Almighty God have mercy upon you; pardon and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life.” These are words and experiences without which man cannot rightly live, being what he is. And the Church is the only place where men can gather to see these things, to hear these things, and to say these things.

IV

But let us watch on while the worship proceeds. The congregation is not permitted to remain overwhelmed by this sense of awareness of sin, even of forgiven sin. That is only the prelude to the real business of life. The summons rings loud, “Lift up your hearts,” and the glad response, “We lift them up unto the Lord. It is right at all times and in all places to give thanks.” Next all is swept into a hymn of praise, in which all ages and all states of being encourage our sad generation to look up. Faces lighten. They see that the generations of men pass; but the gracious things by which man lives do not pass. So that none has so true a sense of proportion, so wise a tolerance, as he who has learnt his wisdom in the worship of the Church. No wonder there often seems more wisdom in an otherwise simple member of the Church than in the cunning and worldly-wise person outside. He (or let us say “she”) is accustomed to listen to and to join in the music of all the ages. She has a standard by which she can judge the sounds of the day.

And now, at the invitation of the priest, the congregation is coming up to kneel at the altar rail. There is no difference of rank, of sex, of age here. All races, all nations, all classes, are side by side here in deep joy. This is the only true democracy. For each one sees here his own worth in God’s sight, and he knows that his brother by his side has precisely that same worth, no more, no less. “Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee. Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.” Himself alone and his own Redeemer; it has all been done to redeem him. And he feels a brother on each side of him, and he knows that each one sepa-

rately is similarly linked as though he alone counted. And thus it is this individual link to the one Lord that makes the brotherhood, a link which nothing can dissever, and which is conditioned forever by the sort of being that Christ the Lord is. The Body of Christ; the holy, catholic Church — in all men's quests for unity, is there any other ultimate basis than this?

V

The Church then stands for unity within the torn, divided personality of men (the greatest mental sickness of our day), and it brings unity within the divided races of men. But the worship also leads to the unity within the divided portions of a man's life. His goal is to make the whole of his days at one with the concentrated worship of the House and Day of God. And that is set forth by the bread and wine, things of nature made into food by the toil of men, and these very things, as manufactured by men, are chosen by God for the sacrament of his body and blood by which the life of the soul is sustained. That so much of his daily life is cut off from God is one of the sins that he has already been confessing. And as he "offers and presents himself, soul and body, to be a living sacrifice to God," he includes in that all the round of his daily life. For this he prays that he may be "fulfilled with God's grace and heavenly benediction," not for himself alone, but because there is a battle to be fought and won. This colony of heaven has to go forth to win the world for Christ who died "to gather into one the children of God that are scattered abroad."

This act of worship then is the characteristic activity and the inner meaning of the Church. And we maintain that so long as this Word is faithfully preached and this sacrament rightly administered, there is the essential Church of Christ. Because we who make up the Church are of all men sinners, and most aware of our sin, we do infinite harm to the eternal Gospel. But so long as at the core there remains the Gospel, it has a way of coming out from its secret place within the Church, and it seizes men and makes them its prisoners.

Our opponent bade us remember the Church where it is most corrupt. We dare not judge another. We stand under the judgment of Christ, and it is to him alone we cry. We referred to the scene in Dostoevsky's dream where Christ stands before the Grand Inquisitor. It will be remembered how that scene ended. Christ remains silent, and then he stoops to kiss the withered cheek of his interrogator. Then he goes his way. His patience knows no defeat and no despair.

WHAT THE ARMY TAUGHT ME ABOUT THE CHURCH

By WINSTON L. KING

DURING some twenty-eight months spent in active service as an army chaplain, twenty-one of them in the European Theatre of Operations, I came to certain conclusions about the work of Protestant churches in the past and what they must do in the future. The conclusions are ones at which a person in civilian life may equally well arrive; yet the army experience of contact with a cross section of American youth, most of them newly through high school, forced upon me certain convictions about the effectiveness of the total Protestant religious and educative process with a strength and urgency which I doubt any other experience could have equalled. To the statement of these convictions and their implications for the task which confronts Protestantism this article is devoted.

I

One of the most interesting facts which came to light was the well-nigh universal registration of army men under some religious banner or other, either denominational or simply "Protestant." From the records of the units in our command at various times I learned that only three or four percent were registered as having no religious preference whatever. The men of these units came from New England, the Middle Atlantic, the Midwestern, and the Southern States. The vagaries of the army's registration personnel may well make these figures somewhat irrelevant. Some clerks apparently decided that a man *must* be classified either as Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, else they had not done their work well. To escape such classification a recruit must make specific protest. And many who had no connection with any church, whose "Protestantism" consisted only in being a non-Catholic, were therefore registered as Protestant. Nevertheless I do believe the figures indicate that most of America is at least vaguely church- or religion-conscious and has some degree of preference.

The other side of the account is that though somewhat over half of American youth registered as Protestant and even assigned itself in

nearly eighty percent of all cases to some specific denomination, that assignment meant relatively little in terms of loyalty to organized religion or religious training of any sort. Attendance at church services in the units I served as chaplain overseas ran from between ten to twenty percent of the total "Protestant" group, averaging about fifteen percent. (Of the lack of religious training I will speak later.) Indifference to religion in the army, to be sure, was not confined exclusively to Protestants, for several Catholic chaplains told me that their army attendance was lighter on the average than that of an equivalent civilian group. Yet Catholic attendance would run roughly three times that from an equal number classified as Protestant.

There was no particular difference, so far as I could observe, among Protestant denominations as such with regard to faithfulness to religious observances. Naturally I did not attempt to keep statistically accurate records of percentage of response. But judging from occasional informal polls taken now and then in new groups and from personal acquaintance with the men, there was no shining pre-eminence of denomination or area in the matter of religious interests or church loyalty. If anything, adherents of fervidly emotional sects showed up less well than others. Unable to find a chaplain whose emphasis exactly agreed with theirs or no longer carried along by the emotional life of their church group, they tended to practice their religion in private.

For many a civilian layman or minister this will probably be no startling revelation. Even a casual observer will suspect that should he add up the average attendance of a community's Protestant churches in many a section of America and divide into it the total non-Catholic population of that community his percentage will not run much over ten or fifteen. And mine is not the first voice to note the high degree of religious defection among us. But one who saw large groups of American youth, representing a cross section of our communities, collected together in a mass, and noted the slight response which religious activity received from them, was much more vividly aware of the pitifully small hold which organized religion has upon the "Protestant" masses and the urgency of the churches' task than he would be in a scattered civilian group.

This would seem to call for a serious consideration of our methods of church evangelism. But I propose to narrow the problem more than that and charge that, on the whole, leaving entirely out of account that large proportion of our population which has no contact with any

church or only a very slight one, we have succeeded only too well in producing people who know nothing of religion, even among the faithful ten or fifteen percent.

The lack of evidence of religious training of any adequate sort among soldiers was appalling in its extent. Most of the service men that I knew personally were almost completely ignorant of the most fundamental teachings of the Bible, unfamiliar with its best-known passages and important personalities, and knew little or nothing of their own denominational teachings. One reasonably intelligent officer insisted that John the Baptist was the founder of his denomination. For many another, Jesus, Paul, Booker T. Washington, Moses, Florence Nightingale, and Peter were about equally insignificant. Most of them would have been hard put to it to find a particular book in the Bible, and the only sacred literature that they could be counted on to know by memory was the Lord's Prayer. As for a strong conviction of the place and importance of the church and the Christian way of life as a distinctive way, there was none.

The inevitable conclusion is that the products of our churches' educative "system" are for the most part religious illiterates and denominational ignoramuses. It seems that in Biblical teaching we follow either a slavish literalism which knows nothing of the broad social and literary context of Biblical writing or a liberalism which knows everything *about* the Bible but little of its content. With regard to the knowledge of our own Protestant and denominational history and tenets we cannot avoid the extremes of crabbed sectarianism and a characterless indiscriminating religiosity which looks upon all denominationalism with a jaundiced eye and cannot defend itself against the inroads of eccentric but thoroughly indoctrinated minorities. This predominance of religious illiteracy in our churches vitiates much of the interdenominational and ecumenical spirit which is now abroad and which is hailed in some quarters as the harbinger of a great new day. All too frequently this broader outlook represents only the tolerance of religious ignorance and the ecumenicity of indifference.

II

This situation is not new nor confined to the army. It is not alone that much-talked-of problem of appealing to the returning service man in our church programs. That *is* an important problem, and some of what is written below will be conditioned by that consideration. But it

is only a part of the total problem of education and indoctrination in religion. There is also the problem of critically surveying and overhauling our whole church program, especially in its educational features. The chief beneficiaries — if these problems are solved — will be those now in the beginning stages of their association with the church.

As a starting point let us state flatly that the church must increase both the *quantity* and *quality* of her teaching program, for it is woefully deficient in both.

The quantity of formal teaching which the average Protestant child receives until he "graduates" from church school is very slight. A scanty hour of "opening exercises" and teaching each week, with ten or twelve weeks out each summer, is about all he can expect during his eight or ten years in church school. In case this youth enters the church fellowship at the age of twelve or fourteen this may be supplemented by a pastor's class totalling a few additional hours. From there on out he must depend upon the scraps which he picks up from the young people's semi-social groups or from the Sunday morning hour of worship. Result: the prevalent religious illiteracy of which we have been speaking.

If this hour of formal instruction were the climax of a week in which there had been abundant other religious teaching periods or techniques it might not be as inadequate as it sounds. But the public school has been thoroughly secularized and cannot be counted on in most cases to give anything more than familiarity with the Lord's Prayer, if that. Only very slowly are churches working out consistent programs of week-day education in religion in connection with the school program. So too the home, that stronghold and buttress of evangelical Protestantism, is almost defunct as a religious force whatever one may say of its sociological status. I question whether any more than five or ten percent of our average "church" homes have anything that could pass for family devotions or religious instruction.

This throws far too much of the burden of religious education upon the formal educative periods in the church schedule. And here we must concern ourselves with the quality of that instruction since it bears so great a share of the total responsibility. The words "vague, sentimental, abstract, and ineffective" are very mild descriptions of much church instruction. Turning away from the ancient catechetical method as pedagogically unsound, and from strong emphasis upon Biblical content in order to escape a rabid conservatism, we have fre-

quently turned to an incoherent, innocuous mass of teaching materials and method. The child begins with a pabulum of bees, birds, and flowers spoon-fed to him by well-meaning but religiously ignorant girls of high school age, diversified by meaningless busy-work. He progresses to a growing-mash of odds and ends of good thoughts, noble truths, and football stories, with a few Bible verses added for seasoning, doled out by any one who can be browbeaten into taking a church school class. He spends the rest of his days feasting on the watery sermonic nectar of sentimental human-interest stories. There *should* be no mystery about the flabby character of adult Protestantism.

Both the quantity and quality of our teaching program must then be altered. There must be an increase of definite instruction, perhaps of a catechetical nature. Lest this should be taken as no more than a call for the return to "the good old ways" I hasten to add that I do not mean by this either a return to a literalistic Biblicism or a narrow orthodoxy of denomination. Neither of these techniques can longer fulfill a useful or Christian function. But I do believe, with all due respect to the ecumenical temper of our time, also taking into account the results of Biblical scholarship, and remaining sympathetic to the use of contemporary religious materials, that there is dire need for denominations and local churches to formulate their specific teachings and inculcate their own people with them. There is no need to choose between a "cover-to-cover" literalism and complete disbelief in the Bible, or between a rigid confessionalism and a spineless liberalism of belief in all religion as equally good — and hence equally worthless. There is a good middle way of strong Protestant Christian conviction, conscious of its differences both of history and doctrine from Catholic and other Protestant groups, yet ardently co-operative and willing to consider organic church unity where it is warranted.

This will mean that some definite and concrete measures must be taken as soon as possible. A greater Biblical and doctrinal content should appear in both church school teaching and in preaching. No one should be able to reach adult church membership without a good grounding in the Scriptures and an intelligent apprehension of what it means to be a Protestant Christian of his own particular denomination. It means the thorough overhauling of the church school as an educative agency: a greater unification of its curriculum; a closer co-ordination of its departments with each other; a more integral tie-up with the complete church life; a serious attempt to secure and train

church school teachers. Still further, if we consider the situation to be serious, it will mean an agreement among Protestant churches as to some of the fundamental teachings of their common faith which can be used as a basis for religious instruction in the public schools or in connection therewith.

III

We have been speaking in particular of the teaching activity of the churches. In slightly broader terms we may say that the Protestant church must reevaluate her method, life, and message more realistically. She must attempt to review it with regard to current human situations and social realities. This revaluation and re-formation must be three-fold: it must be characterized by a redirection toward essentials, by a new practicality of temper and method, and by an ecumenical and world-oriented outlook.

By *essentiality* in religion I mean an emphasis upon matters of first-rate importance for human living and religious faith. One gets the impression from the reaction of many men in the army to organized religion that much of it has somehow been incredibly remote from their daily life or has seemed totally irrelevant to it. We discovered in the army that the church was a dimension of civilian life of which many men had scarcely been aware. And even among those more or less actively connected with a church there was a prevailing sense of the unimportance of what was said and done there for life's major crises. To quote from a recent novel in which a temporarily stranded American pilot muses to himself that airmen are popularly portrayed as praying a great deal:

He had never prayed though. And he was willing to bet that, outside of the Catholics, practically no one he had known in the squadron ever prayed. Not that a lot of them wouldn't have liked to. Not that he hadn't often wanted to himself. The trouble was, there was plenty to pray for but nothing to pray with. The religion people like himself had been brought up in had to do with christenings, weddings, funerals. It had to do with Bible stories, organ recitals, the election of vestrymen, charity pageants, servicemen's canteens. There was nothing wrong with any of it. It was all fine, admirable, okay. But what good did it do a man holding his intestines in his lap or frying to death in the jammed turret of a bomber? What did it have to do with pain, or evil or fear or faith? (Copyright, 1945, James Ramsey Ullman, reprinted by permission of J. B. Lippincott Company.)

Though this is far more articulate than most people would be, it is

typical of a widespread feeling. Somehow we have formulated the Gospel in terms of an accessory to life, to a pleasant easy-going life at that, but not in terms of the ultimate issues of life itself. The religious way of life has been a set of cultural usages and public mannerisms. We have trafficked in the anise, rue, and cummin, the small change of the spiritual life but not with its major issues. And when we have dealt with such issues we have done so only in words, and in such technical or religious language or well-worn preacher's platitudes that it has been meaningless to the average person or palpably remote from the world in which he lives.

It would be well worth the while, or rather it is a matter of the most immediate necessity, for every preacher and teacher to go through his materials and ask himself: What is here of first importance for the teaching of the Christian faith and enabling people to meet the challenges of today's new world? What is left over — the pretty, the purely decorative, the would-be brilliant and clever — should be put into the "when-I-run-out-of-something-to-say" file or consigned to the waste paper drive. He will be surprised at the quantity of window-dressing and pompous piousness he has on hand and at how much of first-rate importance he has failed to touch upon.

Then let him try to reformulate this main-line truth in simpler and more direct terms, in honest every-day language, not hiding his ignorance or lack of conviction behind theological rant. Let the preacher speak not only against the sins of the scribes and Pharisees of 30 A.D. but also to the burning moral issues of the day in which we live, by forum or class if he is not willing to do it in the pulpit — that people may know the Gospel concerns life today not the yesterdays alone. Let us cease trying to glamorize religious truth for the sake of making it palatable to all tastes, to make it good entertainment by dressing it in odd bits of poesy, to scale down the claims of Christian discipleship to popular proportions. There should be no painful emphasis upon the peculiarities of one's own version of the Gospel but the repeated presentation of the central body of Christian teaching with the stark forthrightness of a mountain peak.

In speaking of *practicality*, I think predominantly of method. Practicality calls for a greater flexibility on the part of the church in gearing itself to the demands of the current human situation, a more varied program, and a more direct dealing with the problems of society.

There is at present a strong demand, reinforced by the war experi-

ences of many, that religion "do something for me," that is be eminently "practical." Many soldiers during combat hoped through prayers or sacred medals to gain direct material benefits, such as the success of a military operation, favorable weather, or personal safety. Frequently superstition made its appearance in the quality of religious observances. This was, of course, but the army version of what people try to gain from religion in ordinary life — health, financial success, happiness, ease of mind, and so forth. This demand largely misconceives the true function of religion; and it is stated in terms of personal selfishness which suggest no inkling of the obverse side of the religious life — its call for self-sacrifice and selfless devotion. Nevertheless such an insistence is healthful for the total life of the church. It turns us to an examination of the relation of our methods and message to current life.

It would seem unnecessary to state that the church must needs have an active and genuine concern in the social and economic life of its people and an acute sense of religion's stake in the matter. The war between the social and personal gospels should be drawing soon to a close. Nevertheless there still is strong backing for the opinion that the church should confine itself specifically to "the religious." And religion has an ingrained tendency, accentuated in a day of confusing issues, to turn from the outer world to the inner one of prayer and strictly personal piety.

There is not space here to reopen this whole question. But it can be flatly stated, in view of the strong call for practicality in religion, that a church which narrowly confines its activity and interest to its own four walls, which has no knowledge of what goes on in its own business and social community, and which can live smugly and self-sufficiently beside notorious abuses, carries no conviction to the modern generation of either its worth or essential Christianity.

If we attempt to gear our local Christianity into community life in an effective manner it will entail some very practical measures. Very often local church groups are essentially social-class groups which make outsiders feel unwelcome. Therefore the church activities need to emphasize friendliness, inclusiveness, and practical helpfulness. Its social affairs should be aimed at breaking down class distinctions in its own midst, reaching neglected persons and groups, and strengthening family life within the church. There should be within the church an acute awareness of local social and political situations, an attempt to

lessen class or racial tensions, and a spirit of co-operation in civic enterprise. For the present too a practical Christian outlook should mean a temporary shelving of some of its war-deferred plans for physical expansion in the face of the pressing need for immediately feeding the world's hungry, re-establishing the veteran, rebuilding devastated churches, and relocating the displaced.

There is great opportunity for experimentation in new techniques and approaches. Many army chaplains, having had their eyes opened to the value and necessity for religion to make contact with people where they work and live and being far more conversant with their daily lives than is possible through teacup conversation, are strongly convinced of the necessity for industrial chaplaincies. We must have a more adequate task force of home missionaries of all sorts — technical advisors, social workers, teachers — who can be sent readily to areas of strategic social importance, such as industrial boom centers, places of undue racial tension, and new educational opportunities. The new techniques of visual education offer a tremendous opportunity for religious exploitation and should be developed as rapidly as possible.

This sort of practicality does not obviate a strong emphasis upon worship. Quite the contrary. But it must be a worship of beauty and strength, put in forms and stated in terms which make it meaningful today. For it is not worship as such that the practical mood rejects but a worship which is irrelevant to the present reality.

IV

Placed last, not because it is an afterthought but because it represents the climax of all that goes before, is the need for a thoroughly *ecumenical* and *world-oriented* conception of her task on the part of the church. There is no other kind of Gospel which will do for today. In truth, no other kind has ever really served, and today we but reap the results of too narrow and private a conception of that task. But present world conditions as never before make it impossible longer to hide the spiritual incapacity and essentially unchristian character of a less than world-conscious conception of the church's work.

War experiences as such have not destroyed isolationism among Americans. An isolationist mood will assert itself because of, not in spite of, the return of many service men. They will wish to forget the troubles of the rest of the world and make up for what they have missed

during the last few years. With no buoying sense of spiritual mission in the war, but with a persistent feeling that it was not their war anyway and a feeling of both moral and material superiority toward the peoples of the countries they visited, most service men will wish to plunge with abandon into the Americana of radios, bath tubs, furnaces, autos, ice cream, and generally comfortable living.

And it is purely fantastic to picture returned service men as a religiously conscious force of heroes, strong for democracy and human equality, who will, with the slightest encouragement, carry on a crusade to purge church and society of their wrongs. There *was* deep resentment on the part of many men against the undemocratic nature of officer privileges in the service. And I recall talking at length to one young soldier from a Southern state who spoke in terms of a religious conversion concerning his change of attitude toward Negroes because of his army experiences, and of his determination to work for increased tolerance and greater privilege for the colored peoples. But the army consistently carried out its policy of racial segregation during the war, and many men, because of this and because of contact with racially intolerant fellow-soldiers, picked up the virus of racial prejudice for the first time.

Nevertheless our provincialism and prejudices have been more disturbed than we think. The total effect of the intermingling of diverse social groups, both in and out of the armed services, has been to break down many walls. The belief of the much-traveled veteran and his civilian brother who was moved hither and yon by war work, that they will be perfectly satisfied to settle down at the same old stand in the same old way, is anticipatory rather than actual. Both they and the place may have changed and often they will find the latter stuffy and unsatisfactory.

This dissatisfaction will probably extend to the church, depending on what sort of church it is. Certainly if it is not much more than a church of pleasant social clubs, the place where "our gang" goes, whose main concern as an organization is redecoration of the vestry now that that horrible-war-which-caused-us-so-many-privations is over, and a place where they hear beautiful sentiments which have nothing at all to do with this present world of grim reality — they will not find it a place they care for, though they might not be able to tell you why in so many words. Whether we wish it or not, we have all become socially conscious on a world scale and our interest in the religious way of life

will continue to be strong only if that way has relevance to the forces which move the world.

This has a vital bearing on the question of denominations. Our men in the service demonstrate the fact that our generation is supremely ignorant of and indifferent to denominational differences. War experiences have only strengthened this tendency. Men of all Protestant denominations, including Christian Scientists, Mormons, and Jehovah's Witnesses, as well as men of no denomination at all, worshipped together and mingled in daily life. In the daily grind of military life denominationalism was almost indistinguishable, and in crises it did not seem to matter. To be sure, there was no positive, vital sense of the Christian character of advance toward church co-operation or unity, only a blank stare of incomprehension concerning the whole matter. But the net result, positive, negative, or neutral, is the same: the heyday of denominationalism is long since past. And the urgency for realizing this is the greater precisely because of the widespread indifference to denomination, for with many it is either a co-operating and more united Protestantism or nothing at all — and that quite soon.

Three avenues of ecumenical effort should be followed — all of them at once and as quickly as possible. One is that of co-operation among existing church groups. With all earnestness and on every level Protestants need to explore the possibilities and techniques of co-operation. Local responsibility clearly rests upon the minister. While church sentiment cannot be ignored, the minister can introduce and implement a larger degree of co-operation or hamstringing it almost single-handedly. State and national co-operation rests largely with the attitude of key officials and the backing they can secure from their respective bodies. Promising beginnings toward full-scale Protestant co-operation have been made by councils of churches, the Federal Council, home and foreign missionary co-operation among denominational boards, and in the World Council of Churches a gathering of whose officers preliminary to full organization was recently held in Geneva. But they are only exploratory first steps. Most of the Protestant world lies fast asleep well content with our atomized denominationalism.

The second avenue of ecumenical effort is that of organic union. Local unions are often desirable and should be consummated when practicable. But they suffer usually from two major weaknesses. First, they are frequently unions of necessity, shotgun weddings, so to speak. Each party to the union has become so weak that it can no longer carry on.

The merging bodies collapse together out of sheer inability to stand alone. The binding element in the new union is not a Christian vision of a larger work to be done but the cement of straggling congregations and mounting debt. Secondly, purely local unions suffer from the practical difficulty of working into the dual denominational context. Until community churches become a large denomination themselves — which God forbid — they will suffer from lack of continuity in leadership and program, division of denominational interest, and other related hardships.

Organic union on a total denominational scale is more promising. Probably no Protestant of discernment is in favor of one superchurch, Protestant or Catholic. One increasingly realizes that church divisions long since reached the point of diminishing returns and that the urgent need is for union among many related branches. For there are many strains of the same denominational stock which could reunite with a minimum of inconvenience and theological displacement — witness the Methodist merger. If it requires a six- or seven-word name to distinguish one denomination from another, obviously that particular division is of small moment. So too various middle-of-the-road churches can unite without damaging violence — witness the United Church of Canada. The very least which the situation demands is the regrouping of churches into several strong “family” connections. Here is a promising opportunity for doing something, positive in result and motivated by a Christian sense of values.

The third avenue is really the logical extension of the first two: renewal and strengthening of ties with Christian groups in foreign countries. Global war has poisoned or broken many of these relationships. They must be mended in effective manner as soon as possible. Avoiding all liaison with nationalistic or imperialistic movements and in a spirit of humility, realizing that all of us have been in some measure responsible for world catastrophe, American churches must share both fellowship and material aid. But above all it must be in a sense of spiritual fellowship that we undertake the common task of building Christian values more enduringly into our national lives and of preventing another world disaster.

V

He would be a fool who would paint the world which the church faces or the task which is hers in bright colors. The current scene is

permeated by secularism, be it the individual desire for the "good things" of life or national imperialisms. The desperate physical plight of many in the world makes spiritual values seem to them pure nonsense. The stream of human life is poisoned from many sources: by old and bitter memories which will be long in dimming; by nationalism, rampant among victors, defeated, and bystanders alike; by new tensions and incipient conflicts between race and class; by the vast threat of new scientific destructiveness. The church is weaker rather than stronger by virtue of the war, for the recent world conflict has destroyed many of her promising youth and its brutish struggle weakened the sense of human values throughout the world. She herself is tossed about "with many a conflict, many a doubt." The temptation of the hour is to look to her own material needs rather than the pressing human needs around her. She faces an increasing indifference to herself as an institution — of which the serious mood of wartime brought only a temporary and minor diminution.

But there are also deep currents of a new life and the opening of the doors of new opportunity, perhaps unparalleled in her history. In the heart of the permeating secularism of today there is a frustrating sense of emptiness and dissatisfaction which speaks of spiritual hunger. There is a new, though often grudging and confused, world and social awareness; the masses of the peoples of the world are becoming conscious of common interests and concerns. There are a relaxation of the rigid lines of sectarian division within the churches and a malleability of temper with respect to co-operative effort which we have not seen before. Most of this is but raw material for spiritual shaping, as yet negative and neutral spiritually, rather than positive or Christian; it is opportunity much more than accomplishment. But if the church, discerning the signs of the time, can loudly sound out her major emphases, boldly strike out in new paths, spurn the temptation of local and denominational selfishness, take the leadership against unchristian discriminations and economic conditions, and learn again that she has a faith of world character and importance, an unsurpassed opportunity for accomplishing the salvation of mankind lies before her.

A LITANY OF DESPAIR AND PRAISE

By PAUL GEREN

*(Led by a Japanese Soldier and Followed by Any
Worshiping Assembly of Western Christians)*

THERE are many incongruous features here. The Leader of the Litany and the People who respond are enemies. The Leader is a Japanese soldier, captured on Morotai. He did not write these words for a litany, but for his diary, an institution for which the Japanese soldiers, high and low, showed great attachment.

It is a curious praise of God for us to follow, using again some of the enemy's words; but it is not profane. Many of us who opposed him have also despaired, and his cries for water, for the joyful sight of his own planes in the air, for respite from fire and from being hunted will sound to us very much like our own. Whatever else we hate, we cannot hate the depth of the Leader's cry.

If the Leader and the People have a different faith, as will often be apparent, that does not completely vitiate the praise of God. We believe all things shall be made to praise Him. Not "made" as "compelled against one's will," but "made" as "conformed," "fitted," "made" as in "the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain." However things begin, they shall end in praise of God; however things enter, they shall issue in praise of God. Whosever words they are, they shall at last ring in the praise of God.

THE LITANY

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 15 September): Our boat reached Morotai around 0600. At that moment we were fired upon by enemy warships (15 or 16 ships) and were also strafed by enemy planes. Our boat was sunk. Nine of us swam ashore and hid among the rocks. Due to the intensity of the enemy attack, we were separated. Three of us spent the entire day without a drop of water. Toward evening we approached the boat and searched for the six others, but could not locate them.

PEOPLE: Because of the intensity of the enemy attack, we have become

separated. Forgive our separation, Great One God, and join our separate parts, hard North and supine South, mighty West and petulant Orient, arrogant white and irascible color. Join us in the indivisible body of Christ.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 16 September): Air and naval attacks commenced early in the morning. Throughout the morning we rested under the shade of trees. In the afternoon we found a cave and rested in it. Awakening at midnight, we went to the boat and brought back drinking water to the cave. We have not met the six others.

PEOPLE: We have found an occasional tree and rested under it. We have curled up in a cave and thanked God for it. But after these there have always been the sun and the next day. Everlasting God, help us on to permanence and enough rest in Thee.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 18 September): Conditions are the same every day. Has the enemy landed? The only sounds we hear daily are those of artillery, machine gun and rifle fire. I wonder why our planes have not come . . . Our survival is sustained solely through reverence for the gods and love of Japan. Why don't the Japanese soldiers come?

PEOPLE: Conditions are the same every day. Fortify us for the same-ness, O God. Put iron in this common clay.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 19 September): Early in the morning I prayed to the gods. The enemy is boisterously sounding ship whistles, as though they owned the harbor. It provokes me! The three of us are still living in the cave like moles. There is no water, and it is becoming extremely difficult for us.

PEOPLE: We have been boisterous, O God. We supposed that we owned, not only the harbor, but the ships in it, the land around it and many harbors beyond it. We cannot be boisterous in solitude. Some within our limits must live in caves like moles, without water to drink, while they listen. Take the shrillness off the top of our whistles, O God, and moderate our hilarity with gentleness.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 20 September): I prayed to the gods. The enemy artillery shells are bursting overhead. Therefore we cannot leave the cave. The enemy situation is unknown. Gods of Japan, please send us rain!

PEOPLE: God of Russia, send us trust.
God of France, send us strength.

God of Britain, send us grace to relinquish power.

God of China, cleanse our venality.

God of the United States, make us humble.

God of the rest of men, grant them a hearing.

God of the world, make us one.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 20 September): About 1900, a squall suddenly rolled in. The gods have answered our prayers.

PEOPLE: For us no mercy squall has rolled in, no clean rain has come. God does not answer our prayer, because we will not yet pray it.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 21 September) : I prayed to the gods. I gaze at the sky every day, but the only airplanes I see are those of the enemy. I hope our airplanes will appear and destroy this mobile force. We are surviving only on hardtack.

PEOPLE: We gaze at the sky every day, for, though Thou art everywhere, Thy omnipresence is pointed upward. We lift our eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh our help. We lift our eyes unto the sky where airplanes fly, where Christ was hanged, where brave men dié. So we must, for our fare is hardtack, and if we live not on Thee, then we live by hardtack alone. Deliver us, Good Lord, from hardtack exclusive, and grant us a good feast at the Father's table.

LEADER: (Entry in his diary, 22 September): I prayed to the gods. It rained during the morning. We are still spending the days in the cave just conversing among ourselves.

PEOPLE: Here we are still, just conversing among ourselves. Whittling on the street corner and spitting on the street. Swapping yarns at the barber shop and gossip at the sewing circle, politics at the courthouse, business at the Chamber of Commerce, obscene stories at the club, and pious ones at Church. Just talking, harmlessly, we hope; and with futility, we are reasonably certain. Save us from silence, Great God, but save us also from futile talk.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 23 September): I wonder what our Army airplanes are doing? Ten days have already gone by. I wonder what's to become of Japan whose history extends over 2,600 years.

PEOPLE: What's to become of the United States, which is such a large young man at only 170 years? What's to become of Britain if she must relinquish a part of Empire? What's to become of Russia if she behaves just as all the others have behaved from ancient times? We know the answer. We have gathered so much history, and we fight

our wars so close together that past and present become one tense. We know what will happen before it happens, because it has already happened. A few years of pride corrupt. Decades of power rust the organs of the nation, chiefly its soul. Could we be saved this doom, Everlasting God? We cannot escape the inevitable, but we might obey the law of the inevitable as we have flown by the law of gravity. Break us on this rock, O God, that we may not be ground to powder beneath it.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 25 September): My experience during the last fifteen days will be a lifetime story. I shall always have a deep hatred for the Americans and British, as long as I live.

PEOPLE: Great God, we once swore what he has said, that we would hate him as long as we lived. Both have been sworn to hate. Now we know both what it is to hate and what to be hated. Neither is good, neither is merry, neither is bright, neither is good for the liver, neither is good for the soul after God, neither is fruitful any longer. Enable us, by the Spirit of Christ, neither to hate nor to provoke hatred any longer. For we fear our fifteen days may also be a lifetime, those fifteen full of dregs of all sorts. But with Thee a thousand years are but as a day. Grant us, where we require it, a sense of timelessness which is Thy character, so that we may say of those bad days, a thousand years are but a day, and, of those bright, full-seeing days, a day is as a thousand years.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 1 October): I wish the wind would blow this island away. There is no food for us, and our hardships will increase. O gods, send us some rain. We have faith only in the country of the gods.

PEOPLE: We wished for the sun to do our work, but it would not.

We wished for the wind to blow us to heaven, but it would not.

We wished for an earthquake to do our slaughter, but it would not.

We wished for elements to help, and, except fortuitously, they would not.

We called upon them to destroy us, and they would not commit our suicide.

Give us to know, Mighty God, that sun, wind, earthquake are Thine, And that we are Thine.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 3 October): There isn't a drop of water for our breakfast. Because of the enemy troops, we cannot go to our boat. O gods, please let it rain! The enemy situation in front of us

has not changed. The sun is out, and there will be no squall. We do nothing but suffer.

PEOPLE: We do nothing but suffer. We cannot explain it well, we are tired of speculating about it. We cannot invert and enjoy it, we cannot escape it. Yet enable us to do something besides suffer. To suffer, and suffer gaily so that people will not know whether we are on our way to a dance or to a lion's den. To suffer gloriously, even though the occasion is, as usual, considerably less notable than a lion's or even a cannon's mouth. To suffer brightly, with the name of Christ, if not on our glib lips, then in our foreheads and in the blood stream.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 4 October): Last night around 2200, we went to the boat to get food and water. However, the boat was washed ashore, and there was no food or drinking water. We haven't had water for two days. Our mouths are dry. Salt water helps, but dries again. If it doesn't rain by tomorrow, we shall die.

PEOPLE: Our mouths are dry. Salt water helps, but dries again. Our eyes are blind. The bright lights help, but dim soon after midnight. Our ears are dull. Jazz helps, but the tunes grow old. Our hearts are hungry. Romance brightens, then wears off. Everlasting God, feed us on something substantial, even if it means we must receive Thee.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 6 October): Since there was no water or food in the cave, we left it early in the morning to live in the mountains. On the way, Yoshimatsu told me to observe where the enemy is located. On the return trip I lost my way and was separated from the other two. I found a water hole and drank my fill. I searched desperately for my comrades and finally located them around 1500 hours. I showed them the water hole.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 8 October): Jungles, nothing but jungles in the mountains. We were almost discovered by enemy troops.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 9 October): We are still in the jungles, just wandering aimlessly.

PEOPLE: We are still in the jungles, just wandering aimlessly. We are still in international conferences, refusing to make sacrifices. We are still in politics, refusing power to good men. We are still in prejudices, wallowing in and enjoying them. We are still in the markets, every man zealous for his bit. We are still in roadhouses, as weary of them as of the day's business. Save us, Good God, and lead us out.

LEADER (Entry in his diary, 17 October): During the night I started

to walk. When dawn broke, I was on the airfield. There was no place to hide myself. I managed to escape from enemy troops by seeking refuge behind tree trunks. Today I am close to the enemy.

PEOPLE: There is no place to hide, Kind Lord. We are sick of trying it, weary of looking for places, desolate of supposing a tree will do. Therefore, we come into the open and trust Thee. Wash us, O God. Give us some fitting garments, food at Thy table, some rest in Thee. Then give us a trumpet, or a sword, or a pen, and a task in the only war that is holy.

BISHOPS, PRIESTS, AND PRESBYTERS

By JOHN HENDERSON POWELL, JR.

I

THE *Nature of an Authoritative Church*. An authoritative Church is not a Church in which the authority resides in those who are merely members. An authoritative Church is a Church in which the authority resides in, and is expressed by, a certain official class, which is thus pre-eminently the Church. Because the authority of the Church is something that is only recognized within the Church itself, its very existence requires an essential distinction between certain classes of individuals within the Church.

The contention of the non-Romanist authoritarians is that our Lord appointed the Twelve Apostles as his personal representatives in the world and as the official leaders and governors of the Church. These in turn ordained certain individuals called "bishops" to be their successors, who delegated certain of their responsibilities and powers to lesser clergy called "priests," who through the ordination of the bishops became the proper mediators of God's grace to men. The authority of the Church, therefore, resided originally in the Twelve Apostles, was transmitted by them to the bishops, and is delegated in some lesser degree to the priests. Apart from these bishops in properly ordained succession from the Apostles there is, therefore, according to this theory, no Church at any particular time and place in history.

Clearly there are involved in this position certain assumptions regarding historic fact. In the first place, it is assumed that our Lord did appoint the Twelve Apostles as his personal representatives in the world and as the official lords and governors of the Church; that he clearly and definitely invested them, in other words, with absolute authority over the Church. In the second place, it is assumed that the Apostles did ordain certain individuals called "bishops" as their successors, different from all other orders in the Apostolic Church, and did invest them with the same authority as had been given the Apostles by our Lord himself. In the third place, it is also assumed, though this is in a sense an entirely different position, that our Lord also ordained a Christian order of priests, after the pattern of the Old Testament priesthood, to officiate at a solemn and sacred sacrifice,

which he himself instituted after the pattern of the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and that thus these priests are mediators of God's grace to men, and necessary to man's acceptable approach to God.

There appears to be some difference in emphasis here between the strictly Episcopal and the Roman Catholic points of view. If our Lord set apart an official Christian priesthood in the institution of the service of the Holy Communion as a sacrifice, then it is as priests that the Apostles exercise their chief authority and highest function in the life of the Church, and the episcopal succession is a minor detail of organization within the priesthood, since the principal distinction even of bishops is their ordination as priests, and the Church is essentially this sacerdotal order.

With the Roman Church the fundamental distinction is not that between bishops and presbyters, but that between the clergy and the laity. This is clearly set forth by the Rev. George Stebbing, C.S.S.R., in an officially approved Roman Catholic history of the Church, where he says:

By its very constitution from the beginning the Catholic Church was an ordered and organized body, distinguished into teachers and taught, clergy and laity. The whole plenitude of authority and teaching was in the Apostolic College. Sharply differentiated from this was the body of the faithful, bidden to take their doctrine from the Apostles, as these last had taken theirs from Our Lord, or as pupils take a lesson from their masters. As to further subdivision of rank among the teachers and rulers, it is only little by little that the signs of this emerge, as the Church grew and the Apostles died out.¹

Here one sees clearly the Catholic notion of teaching as authoritative utterance, and the Catholic assumption that all ecclesiastical authority resides in the clergy as such, without distinction between bishops and priests.

From the strictly Episcopal point of view, however, the priests derive their authority and right of officiating at the Eucharist from the ordination of the bishops; they are mere delegates of episcopal power and authority, and the Church is in its essence the historic Episcopate.

We must briefly consider, then, three questions.

II

The Authority of the Apostles. First: Did the Apostles exercise absolute authority over the life and thought of the Church in their day?

The Jerusalem church, like all others at the time, apparently

modelled its organization on that of the synagogue, and the church, like the synagogue, was governed by elders or presbyters.

There is no indication whatever that the Apostles ever formed a separate council of higher rank and authority in the Jerusalem church than that composed of both apostles and elders. Certainly in the Jerusalem conference, referred to in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, they sit together in one body, and are evidently presided over by James, who, though a brother of the Lord, was not one of the Twelve, and presumably not even a believer during Christ's ministry. And the pronouncements of this conference are sent out as coming from both the Apostles and the elders.

It is significant that the Apostles did not settle this whole question by themselves, and that the matter was not presented to them alone for settlement.

It certainly cannot be contended, either, that the so-called Jerusalem Council spoke with final and absolute authority throughout the Church; for that part of its pronouncement regarding Gentile Christians which counselled them to abstain "from blood and from things strangled," was most assuredly not followed later throughout the Gentile churches, and was virtually abrogated by Paul in the general purport of his Epistle to the Galatians, and more specifically in his statement in I Corinthians 10:25; 26.

Furthermore, on the basis of any supreme and infallible Apostolic authority in the early Church, it is impossible to account for the position and influence of Paul.

It is well enough to say, as he does himself, that he received his ordination direct from God. It certainly did not come through any special appointment by the Twelve, or by the council of the church in Jerusalem. Paul is at great pains to point this out in the first two chapters of Galatians, because he claims no subordinate or derived authority from any other leaders in the Church.

It would seem therefore, that the notion of an infallible Church, or of an infallible authority in the Church, is something that came later in history and cannot be understood apart from the subsequent development of the Church's organization and the later events which affected its life.

III

The Relation of Bishops and Presbyters. The second question which must be considered is: Did the Apostles ordain "bishops" as a distinct

order within the Church, to be their successors, and did they invest them with absolute and infallible authority over the life and thought of the Church?

The specific point at issue here is the historic relation between "bishops" and "presbyters." If at the outset bishops were the same as presbyters, then there is every indication that the Apostolic conception of the Church and its orders was much simpler and less authoritarian than this theory of an authoritative episcopate requires.²

The first Jewish Christians did not consider themselves followers of a new religion, but looked upon Christianity as a sect of Judaism — as it was regarded by the Jews themselves. (Acts 2:46, 21:17-36, and 24:14.) It was natural therefore, as Bishop Lightfoot contends, that the Christians should organize synagogues of their own,³ and that "a body of elders or presbyters would be chosen to direct the religious worship and partly also to look after the temporal well-being of the society."⁴

It certainly appears from a study of the pertinent texts that the terms "presbyter" and "bishop" in the New Testament refer to the same person and office, and that the "presbyters" were the properly ordained successors to the Apostles.

In Acts 14:23 we read that Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey, as they were returning to Antioch through the cities they had previously visited, "ordained (King James) them *elders* in every church." And in Acts 20:17 we read that Paul on his way to Jerusalem for the last time sent from Miletus to Ephesus, "and called to him the *elders* of the church," to whom in the course of his address he said, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you *bishops*, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). Again in his First Epistle to Timothy (3:1-7), after setting forth the qualifications of a *bishop*, Paul goes on to say to Timothy himself: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (I Timothy 4:14), and later adds: "Let the *elders* that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the word and in teaching" (I Timothy 5:17). And in his Epistle to Titus, he says: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain (King James) *elders* in every city, as I gave thee charge; if any man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having children that be-

lieve, who are not accused of riot or unruly. For the *bishop* must be blameless, as God's steward" (Titus 1:5-7. See also 1: 7-9).

Not only are the two terms used interchangeably in the Epistle to Titus, but the qualifications for the *elders* given here are almost identical with those for the *bishop* in I Timothy. Furthermore, it is significant that Timothy himself had been ordained by "the laying on of the hands" — not of *bishops* but of *the presbytery*!

Bishop Lightfoot sets forth this whole point most effectively in an extended note on "the synonyms 'bishop' and 'presbyter,'" in his Commentary on Philippians.⁵ Here he considers various Scripture references, including I Peter 5:1, 2, where the author, who at the outset calls himself an apostle (I Peter 1:1), as a "fellow-elder" exhorts the "elders" of the churches addressed to "fulfil the office of bishops with disinterested zeal." Lightfoot goes on to show that St. Clement of Rome, writing probably in the last decade of the first century, considers the terms convertible, that it is not until the first part of the second century that one finds the indication of a distinction between them in the writings of Ignatius and Polycarp, and that Jerome, writing in the latter part of the fourth century or first part of the fifth, is convinced that originally the two terms referred to the same office. Jerome says: "Among the ancients, bishops and presbyters are the same, for the one is a term of dignity, the other of age." And in another place this great scholar of the early Church affirms: "The Apostle plainly shows that presbyters are the same as bishops. . . . It is proved most clearly that bishops and presbyters are the same." And in a third passage he declares: "If any one thinks the opinion that the bishops and presbyters are the same to be not the view of the Scriptures but my own, let him study the words of the apostle to the Philippians."⁶

Bishop Lightfoot goes on to point out that Jerome was not alone in this opinion in the early Church, but that among "his predecessors the Ambrosian Hilary had discerned the same truth," and that "of his contemporaries and successors, Chrysostom, Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, all acknowledge it."⁷

In reading through the Book of the Acts, one interested in this point must be struck by the number of times the word "elders" is used in reference to the elders of Israel. The word appears at least eighteen times in this one book: eight times referring to Jewish elders, and ten times to Christian.

Thus government by presbyters appears to be the type of order and organization with which the Apostles and their earliest converts would be most familiar, and would therefore be the most natural one for them to adopt in the Christian synagogue or ecclesia. They knew nothing about diocesan bishops, and there is no indication in the New Testament that the Apostles considered themselves as such. They did not divide the world between them, each presiding over the faithful within a certain area, like the successors of Alexander dividing his empire; nor, as Canon Streeter remarks, did they sit in Jerusalem, "like a College of Cardinals, systematising the doctrine, and superintending the organization, of the Primitive Church."⁸ This whole conception of church government was probably as foreign to their thought as anything could have been, and as distasteful.

The fact that the members of the Jewish Sanhedrin had the official designation of *presbyters*, or *elders*, would indicate that the Apostles could think of no higher title, either for themselves, or for those whom they appointed to preside over the assemblies of Christians. And this is borne out also by the use of the term in the Apocalypse, where those who sit upon the four and twenty thrones about the great throne in heaven are called, not bishops, but presbyters (Revelation 4:4).

It would seem therefore that there are no grounds in the earliest records of Christian history for the second contention of the ecclesiastical authoritarians that bishops were from the beginning a distinct order in the Christian ministry, ordained as the only proper successors of the Apostles, and invested by them with peculiar authority over the Church. It would appear rather, that originally "bishop" was merely another name for "presbyter," an office in the early Church derived quite naturally from the simple and familiar organization of the Jewish synagogue.

This conclusion is confirmed by the Roman Catholic point of view on this matter, as set forth by Father Stebbing, who says:

The Apostles did provide themselves with successors in all the powers that were to be of permanent institution, and they did so by ordination or the laying on of hands, the men thus consecrated to the office of rulers and teachers of the Church being called bishops and priests, almost indifferently at first.

The office which Father Stebbing here refers to as that of priest was, of course, that of the "presbyter." This word was later translated "priest," but has in it no indication whatever of priestly function and

is not the Greek word for indicating such functions in the New Testament. Its proper translation is "elder." Father Stebbing goes on to say:

And then after a while one of those thus ordained becomes the monarchical ruler and high priest of each Christian community, whether it is a city or a district, or less. But, at first, this would be a distinction of jurisdiction, rather than of order, and the plurality of presbyters gathered round the *Episcopus* of any Christian community would probably at first be his equal in order, though not appointed by authority to rule any distinct body of Christians. It is in the writings of St. Ignatius that we first find the three distinct orders of bishops, priests, and deacons spoken of as existent and normal for the Church's organization. No doubt we can believe in their direct institution by Our Lord Himself, but we must rest our belief on the tradition of the Church, and not on the words of the New Testament, for in those we shall not find them.*

IV

The Question of a Christian Priesthood. The third question which must be considered is whether our Lord did ordain a distinct order of men to constitute a Christian priesthood for the mediation of divine grace and the offering of some special Christian sacrifice corresponding to the sacrifices of the Jewish Temple. There is certainly no indication in the New Testament that the Apostles considered themselves as a special order of priests, or that there was any such special order within the Christian Church during New Testament times. The Apostles were not of the family of Aaron, and under the circumstances it would scarcely occur to them to think of themselves as occupying a position in the Christian community corresponding to that of the chief priests among the Jews, since at the outset they still considered themselves Jews and showed no intention of breaking with the worship of the Temple, much less of setting up a separate sacerdotal system in competition with it.

And later when the Church had broken with the Temple and the Christian apologists were trying to refute the common belief in the necessity of the Jewish sacrifices, there is no attempt to set up a new order of priests and a new system of sacrifices to take the place of the old. Rather, the teaching in the Epistle to the Hebrews is that the old has been abrogated once for all by the sacrifice of Christ, who is our high priest, eternal in the heavens (Hebrews 7:26-28), and that therefore all Christians are a holy and royal priesthood (I Peter 2:9).

Moreover, in the characteristically simple forms of Christian wor-

ship, there is no indication of anything for a special order of priests to do. There were no animal sacrifices. The forms of worship in the beginning were simply meeting together for prayer and praise and the breaking of bread, — which is evidently some simple ceremony of thanksgiving in connection with a common meal.

The rite of baptism required no priest for its administration, and there is no suggestion anywhere in the New Testament that the celebration of the Lord's Supper had in it such a notion of sacrifice that it required a priest to officiate at its proper observance. There is in our Lord's institution of the service no specifying of a special priesthood, no liturgical form for the consecration and transformation of the elements, and no suggestion that this act of remembrance is in itself a sacrifice requiring priestly officiation. It may commemorate the sacrificial death of Christ; but this commemoration as such contains no idea of the necessity of any repetition of the original sacrifice commemorated. As a matter of fact, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks expressly of Christ's sacrifice as final (Hebrews 7:27) doing away with the necessity for any more such sacrifices. The fundamental idea was evidently to make religious rites more spiritual; and this is borne out by the practice of the Christian community in the New Testament.

V

The Historic Development of Episcopacy. There is, therefore, apparently no clear evidence in the New Testament for the existence in the Church at that time of either diocesan bishops, priests, or the sacrifice of the Mass.

That all these things were in the Church later is a matter of history; and how they came into the order and practice of the Church must also be a matter of history.

One does not need to be a very profound student of the first two centuries of the Christian era to see that the order of diocesan bishop might be a very natural development in the sub-apostolic age, and that it would give to the Church a much more efficient type of government than it had had previously; which under the circumstances of those times, particularly, would be of the greatest advantage and importance.

If there is ever to be any effective unity within the non-Romanist Churches, Protestants must draw a very careful distinction between

episcopal organization and a sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry. The two things are not at all the same, and are not in any sense dependent upon each other; though both positions are found with varying emphases in the Episcopal Church. Actually there can be no religious objection to episcopal government as such, and there is great advantage in an historic Episcopate, if this is divorced from all false claims of peculiar authority through Apostolic Succession. But there is a serious question whether there can be any compromise with a sacerdotal conception of the ministry without losing everything that Protestantism stands for in connection with a more spiritual conception of religion and life; which is certainly one of the distinctive and most important features of Christianity as distinguished from both Judaism and Graeco-Roman paganism.

REFERENCES

1. *The Story of the Catholic Church*, by George Stebbing, C.S.S.R., pp. 66, 67.
2. For a very detailed consideration of the development of the organization of the early Church by two leading Anglican scholars one is referred to a dissertation on *The Christian Ministry* by J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Bishop of Durham, Honorary Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, in the latter part of his *Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, pp. 181-269, Macmillan, 1913; and the book entitled *The Primitive Church—Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry*, by Burnet Hillman Streeter, Reader in Christian Origins in the University of Oxford; Fellow of the Queen's College, Oxford; Canon of Hereford; Fellow of the British Academy; Hon. D.D. Edin; Hon. D.D. Durham, Macmillan, 1929. Certainly neither of these Church of England dignitaries could be accused of having Presbyterian prejudices.
3. James 2:2. See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 192. In this connection one should notice Acts 18:26. Was this a Christian or a Jewish synagogue? If the latter, as is evidently the case, it seemingly indicates that the Christians were still worshipping in the Jewish synagogue, and that this was where Priscilla and Aquila had heard Apollos speak.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-99.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 98, 99.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
8. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

THE CHURCH PRESS: BULWARK OF DENOMINATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

By R. E. WOLSELEY

AS seen through their official and unofficial publications, the Protestant denominations in the United States are like so many national states proclaiming and insisting upon their own sovereignty.

This generalization can be made at a time when secular leaders are struggling to design new world organizations to achieve a unity which will banish war with its infinitely increased frightfulness and to solve our outstanding international problems.

Yet the evidence in support of the generalization is undeniable. The pragmatic test of any press, be it secular or religious, is finding out what it presents its readers. And the test to which the church press was put in a recent examination of its content, while it was not absolute, shows that the Protestant denominational newspapers and magazines are for the most part continuing to harden denominational lines while in some ways the rest of the world is becoming unified. Evidence for this statement is now to be presented.

I

The data of the present study were derived from a reading of 184 issues of sixty-four different papers and periodicals representing twenty-one different denominations and ranging through the whole spectrum of American denominationalism. These are listed in a table appended to this article. The essence of these findings, if this large and carefully selected sampling is representative, is that the major portion of editorial and news space of the Protestant press is devoted to denominationalism. Contrariwise, it was learned, very little space is used to present the viewpoint and news of a common Christianity. Not only is little space devoted to ecumenical concerns, but what space is allowed is often obscure and casual. This space usually treats of common Christian affairs in a neutral or approving fashion.

Before giving further details on the findings of this study it is in order to explain further how it was conducted. The sixty-four different

papers were obtained at general, college, or theological seminary libraries, from co-operating editors, and from ministers. Some were official church organs of national standing, others publications of state or regional scope, directly or indirectly representative of their respective denominations. No one suggested to the author which publications should be selected. The list of religious bodies in the United States, as contained in *The World Almanac* for 1946, was consulted merely to assure (a) that most of the largest denominations and a good sprinkling of the smallest and medium-sized were included, and (b) that there was no confusion between, for example, such bodies as the five varieties of the Church of God. In each issue of the papers examined the amount and position of material dealing with other denominations or with joint denominational efforts were noted. The type of material used, whether editorial, news article, photograph, or cartoon, also was observed. Generally four consecutive issues were examined; in some instances fewer had to be used. Most of these 184 issues were published in the fall of 1945 or the winter of 1946. No editor was aware why his publication was being studied by a university professor of journalism until after the issues selected had been examined; and few of the more than sixty editors involved are aware of it even now.

II

The summary tabulation of results reveals how little place the type of material under examination had in these publications. Some of the major facts are:

The one hundred and eighty-four issues of the sixty-four publications contained a total of 3,621 inches of non-denominational material of the type under examination. This is an average of 19.06 inches each, or about two columns.

One hundred and forty-six of these issues contained 1,147 inches (31.6 percent of the total), an average of 7.1 inches or about three-fourths of a column. These represented fifty-one different publications.

Thirty-eight issues of thirteen publications printed a total of 2,474 inches of "ecumenical" material, or about 68.4 percent of all. The average space in these was 22.04 inches per publication, or about two and one-fifths columns. Sixteen publications used none whatsoever of this material in their forty-three issues.

The estimated aggregate space available for non-advertising material in all issues examined of the sixty-four publications was 64,000 inches;

the space allotted this special material was approximately five percent.

It is further to be observed that much of the space allotted to the ecumenical church in these publications was for coverage of some of the big meetings, such as the gathering in Geneva during February, 1946, sponsored by the World Council. But the week-by-week or month-by-month impression of ecumenical interests that readers will get is different when the publication gives regular space than when it only occasionally "splashes" such news. An auxiliary study might well be made of these same publications to see how many gave attention in the past to the notable world conferences, such as those at Madras and Geneva, or to the Federal Council sessions at Delaware and Columbus.

III

Undoubtedly the editors of some of these publications believe that they are generous with the space provided for the news of the church at large. They announce through their mastheads that they subscribe to Religious News Service, Worldover Press, or other services. They have departments labelled "Church News" or "News of the Churches." But they appear to throw away most of the RNS releases and to interpret "Church and Churches" as meaning, of course, only the Methodist or Southern Baptist or whatever denomination it is they serve. The results of this protracted reading of denominational publications have been discussed with a few laymen. Their comments, in effect, have been "Of course, that's what you *would* find. These papers are just the house organs or trade papers of the denominations."

Now although secular house publications and business journals are dedicated to the interests of their own groups, many of them, nevertheless, see the value of keeping their readers informed about the progress of an industry as a whole. Christianity is at least as international as business, and yet we find many denominational weeklies and monthlies which in an entire sixteen- or thirty-two page issue will quite ignore the larger world of the other churches and other religions or their efforts at co-operation.

The only realization of the existence of other agencies for Christianity which some publications evidence is the dependence of the editors and their office shears upon material from the papers and magazines of other churches. These liftings and borrowings generally are of editorials, articles, and jokes that deal with theological theories or comment upon the denomination that did the clipping to begin with.

Even when news or views of genuine ecumenical significance are published — something for which the believers in the ecumenical church must be properly grateful — they often are not presented in a fashion to make them appealing to the reader or calculated to win his attention. Likely as not they are used as filler or, as with certain Lutheran, Free Methodist, and Southern Baptist publications, to reinforce denominational emphases, such as anti-Catholicism or opposition to the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Only two or three papers give enthusiastic display to general news of the religious world. For example, the *Church Times*, a Presbyterian journal, generally uses its entire front page to tell its readers about the religious news outside Presbyterianism. The *Churchman*, the Protestant Episcopal magazine, sometimes devotes as much as ten pages an issue to such information.

The most frequent ecumenical matter in the publications in question consists of news and news features (straight news accounts as opposed to interviews, informational articles, and opinion articles), with editorials ranking second in quantity. Within the first classification the features most often found are accounts of visits of delegations of Protestant churchmen to Europe and the Orient, coverage of world or national conferences of interdenominational groups, news of joint efforts to organize feeding or other relief programs, interviews with leaders of other churches than the one publishing the paper, historical accounts of friendly denominations, and informative articles about the World Council or other groups with similar ideals. With a few exceptions, materials of this character were favorable to the idea of ecumenicity.

While in the main the editorials also were in support of the ecumenical idea, a number, either directly or indirectly, were opposed to it. Some attacked certain other Protestant denominations, others attacked the organizations for church unity.

It should not be thought that this writer believes church papers should withhold sincere criticism of one another or of other denominations simply because a by-product of such criticism, if adverse, may be to reduce co-operation between the churches. It is the spirit and tone of criticism, not its existence, which may be questioned.

Certainly there is a world of difference between the tone of the following short article contributed to the *Arkansas Methodist* of January 17, 1946, and the violent attacks on the principles, persons, and or-

ganizations favorable to church co-operation which are indulged in by some of the periodicals examined.

These are days when people of larger vision are thinking about Ecumenical Christianity which, no doubt, is a practical factor to be dealt with in future years . . . In the community where I am pastor there are other churches, a Methodist, a Baptist (Missionary), a Baptist (General), and a Pilgrim Holiness. I have had the privilege of filling the pulpits of all these churches, which is not a common thing in this locality or anywhere south of the Mason Dixon line. The answer as to how I happened to be granted these courtesies is simply that I encouraged myself to appreciate these denominations which were not of my belief. I strove to visualize the common elements that they possessed with my faith and my denomination. I am a Methodist by conviction, but this does not hinder me from practicing the Golden Rule in my attitude toward the ministers of these churches or their people.

IV

It is possible, of course, to go through any set of publications and find fault with their choice and emphasis with respect to content. This is a spare-time occupation for many an American citizen, who belabors his daily newspaper for not printing enough or too much crime news or criticizes publishers for using too many comics or too few sermons. In the field of religious journalism it is just as easy to make unthinking recommendations and criticisms.

The religious editor is under many pressures and has many handicaps. It would be harsh to say that this general neglect of the news of the church at large or their concentration on denominational affairs is directly the result of unwillingness to give space in better proportion. Whatever the reasons, editors of these church publications nevertheless often present a strange fare to their readers. It would be difficult to defend the value of many a stale sermon, dull departmental report, vacuous general article, or platitudinous editorial as compared with the readily available material on the ecumenical church.

Many church papers devote more space to jokes than to news of the churches at large. This may be a necessary reader-interest if their public is so religiously undeveloped as to demand that sort of content in its church paper. (The jokes, even as jokes, could have higher news quality. One was encountered which was credited to the *Chicago Record-Herald*. On checking with a history of American journalism it was discovered that the *Record-Herald* had ceased publication in 1919!)

In one magazine, handsomely printed and carefully edited, appeared an article headed "What Price Ignorance?" After recapitulating examples of ignorance in secular and religious life the author asked: "What is the price of ignorance? It is defeat, disillusionment, despair; often it is suffering, sorrow, or ruin. Happily, ignorance, relatively speaking, need not prove permanent. Much of it can be removed." He then went on to quote George Matthew Adams, who said, "The only damaging ignorance is not to want to know, not to want to learn, not to want to explore and discover . . ." Yet four issues of the very publication in which this appeared devoted not an inch of space to any other denomination but the sponsoring one, or gave any assistance whatsoever, through publicity, to the church working in unity. And this magazine is that of a denomination numbering nearly 6,000,000 members, almost all of whose official publications show much the same lack.

In still another paper, of a different but even larger denomination, there appears each week, on the second page, under the heading "Wallet of the Week" and in large type, such deeply significant material as the following:

THE HAWAIIAN GECKO is said to be of Asiatic origin. It is a nocturnal lizard which spends the day in any crack or crevice and comes out at night to prey upon the insect life of the Islands. It has a camouflage coloring which is a protective endowment. It is particularly effective in mosquito extermination. Although it has the more or less repulsive appearance of a reptile, it seems to be harmless. The inhabitants of the Islands know of the presence of the geckos by the faint squeaks which come from the rafters of the houses.

A companion paragraph announced that

A NEW SYNTHETIC DETERGENT is now on the market which, according to the chemists, is better than soap for laundry and other household uses. It works equally well in either hard or soft water, requires little rubbing, and does not cause fabrics to shrink or colors to fade. Dishes can be left to dry without wiping. This should take some of the drudgery out of laundering and dishwashing.

These, it should be noted, are not "fillers." They appear on a carefully planned page. Silly short paragraphs can be found at the column ends of many church papers. They can be forgiven as necessary for speedy production. But three issues of the periodical just quoted contained no more than six inches of news of the Christian church in general.

V

Why this indifference to the ecumenical church, as exhibited by the little space devoted to it when space is wasted on far less worthy contents? Reasons both external and internal are apparent.

Certain denominations, some large, others small, are antagonistic by conviction to church union, to church co-operation which they suspect of leading toward union or believe to compromise their principles. They therefore oppose bodies seeking to promote co-operation. This attitude naturally transfers itself to the official publication whose sponsors obviously will select only editors who agree with the denominational position.

Curiously, however, the present study showed some of these denominations making a good showing with respect to ecumenical materials as measured by space given to them. For this, however, thanks are due to their unofficial publications rather than to the sanctioned ones. Such a situation is not difficult to explain. Even in the conservative denominations a minority may dissent from the official position, including its attitude toward ecumenicity. One of the results of such dissent may be the existence of an unsanctioned paper, often local or regional, or a national organ of one wing or party within the denomination. This paper may make a special point of emphasizing what the overhead organization seeks to depreciate. In one denomination that is only moderately interested in featuring the ecumenical church, there is to be found one of the few papers that supports this ideal for all it is worth. In another denomination which is almost solid in its official opposition to ecumenicity one discovers a weekly whose editor steps lightly on 'the headquarters' policy. Yet he finds himself printing some of the most virulent articles on the subject because he "rents" editorial or reading matter space to a board secretary. Such institutional advertising by "departments," dressed up as news, is one of the evils of religious journalism. The editor is damaged by it more than he is helped. Usually he sells the space, probably from two columns to a page, at production cost. Likely as not the copy is badly written, violating most of the rules of good journalism because those who produce it are novices. Yet the editor dare not touch it. If he cuts it, if he increases the number of paragraphs to make the type more readable, or if he suggests small engravings to heighten reader interest, he is told that he has nothing to say about this space, which is the depart-

ment's or board's private bailiwick. He may suspect that the eyesores that mar his paper have few readers and he would chuck the whole business if he did not value his few peaceful days. Through such channels the official attitudes are perpetuated. They are maintained directly, even if not too effectively, through the type; they are maintained indirectly, and very effectively, by conditioning the editor.

Other explanations of the scant attention to ecumenical affairs in the denominational press may be briefly mentioned:

1. The lack of money to finance membership in or subscriptions to one of the religious news agencies. One of the best of these charges \$25.00 a month. But numerous church papers are run on a budget which could not withstand a charge of even \$5.00 a month for this type of material. However, an editor zealous for its presentation can secure enough free material from the World Council and other groups working for co-operation among the churches to provide much copy despite the relatively high cost of the best news services.

2. Again, the time element works against the publication of some news of the ecumenical church. A monthly magazine usually is prepared several months ahead of publication. News of an event in February would be stale by May or June. This is less of an excuse for the absence of editorial comment or special articles, though it does make such comment often untimely. The weekly publications, therefore, are more to be criticized than the monthlies. However, the weeklies in this sampling were found even more ungenerous with their space than the monthlies.

3. Editors of denominational publications appear, in the main, to be middle-aged or elderly persons, usually former preachers, board workers, or some other church officials. Rarely are they experienced journalists. Often they are expected to do far too much beside produce their publications. Their duties include one, or, more often, more than one of the following: editing the magazine or paper, or directing its editorial production, writing for it, soliciting advertising, serving churches, serving as secretaries of organizations, assisting on public-relations work for the denomination, conducting evangelistic campaigns, teaching at denominational schools, speaking in public. An editor who is out of town frequently soon loses track of just what goes into his publication. It is hopeless to expect under these conditions that they will give sufficient attention to whether the ecumenical church is adequately represented.

4. Religious journalists, not being, as a rule, professionally experienced or trained, do not plan their publications carefully. They tend to leave to still less competent lay assistants the details of technique (or to hamstring the trained young assistant by resisting his new ideas) or simply to send to the printer a batch of copy and let the printer assemble the publication as he wishes. Fair emphasis, measured allotment of space, and the exercise of other controls come only from editors who know their jobs and are willing to make up dummies or outlines, estimate copy length, and do the other chores of careful editorial production.

5. Finally, religious editors, because they are inadequately trained for their profession, lack knowledge of the latest techniques for gauging public opinion and reader interest. Let them receive a few protests (or maybe just one) from readers, and they swiftly abandon a forward-looking policy. A tyro in the profession is hardly equipped to withstand such internal pressures or to assert the constructive leadership in moulding opinion which is his essential function.

VI

Let us suppose, however, that the editor is not faced with too many of these obstacles. What shall his policy be on news of the ecumenical church relative to the presentation of denominational interests? How can he justify the use of his precious space for the concerns of other religious groups, especially if his own members are not too friendly toward them? He might adopt the philosophy expressed by Walter Whitacre in the Winter 1944-45 issue of the *National Lutheran*:

If we believe (we do, don't we?) that the Lutheran concept of the law and the gospel covers every phase of living, how shall we bring this idea before the masses in such a way as to influence their thinking and action, except through the printed page?

We are too provincial as a church. Our divisions make our voice weak and ineffective. An ecumenical church should have definite ideas on the race problem, marriage and divorce, intemperance, labor unions, and all kindred subjects that are troubling the world and it should not hesitate to speak out. . . . As a church we owe it to our people to help them clarify their thinking and to inspire them to make a definite contribution to a better world.

Under such a conception, must the editor print as much ecumenical material as, say, *Advance*, the Congregational Christian monthly,

which averaged 130 inches of material in each issue of three surveyed or of the Protestant Episcopal *Churchman*, which in each of two issues carried 123 inches? It is not possible to provide a linear formula. The editor should strive, however, for *reasonably prominent, regular display* of the concerns of the world-church. Regularity is important, being a principle of persuasion that stands at the top of such principles.

The ideal situation for a denomination's publications is that its house magazine or paper shall give some space each issue to news of the religious world in general, as well as an occasional editorial or special article, and that there be a second and more general publication for the whole denomination (and its allied denominations). The latter could give more space to the ecumenical church than the house publication. The Presbyterian *Church Times*, as already noted, devotes most of its first page regularly to general church news.

This would mean that every local church family would have to subscribe to two publications to get adequate coverage of its own denomination's affairs as well as those of the others or of the united church. When so many religious bodies complain that even their main publication goes largely unsupported this would seem like a futile suggestion. Possibly, however, the lack of interest in many such journals is explained by the fact that they are dull, and they may be dull because they are grubbing around in denominational details and ignoring most of the outside world. Church editors need, also, to realize that there is a difference between *subscribing to* and *reading* their papers. Much church circulation is based upon denominational loyalty. It is dutiful, but not necessarily desirable.

Church homes that support several women's magazines, possibly two secular newspapers, as well as general publications, like *Reader's Digest* and the *American Magazine*, can be expected to support, also, a denominational paper and an interdenominational publication. If this cannot be expected the religious interest of the family is suspect.

VII

Certain church leaders have recently been throwing out a fresh challenge to religious journalism. Chancellor William P. Tolley of Syracuse University declared last December at the annual *Zion's Herald* dinner that the "Orphan Annie reading public" needs timely and independent interpretation of the tremendous volume of reli-

gious news today. An anonymous writer in the *World Alliance News Letter* for April puts the issue even more broadly:

The churches have one task above all others, that of reconciliation. To create understanding among the nations has always been an essential part of our historic faiths, but today Judaism and Christianity look upon that task as an inescapable imperative. The issues at stake mean literally life or death — a world of organized peace or a shambles of chaos and devastation.

The organizations that do not lose world contact during wars and other man-made catastrophes are chiefly the scientific and religious bodies. Only through the ecumenical organization has the internationalism of the church been maintained. So far as the missionary movement goes, the denominations acknowledge this, through their publications. They do not all, as yet, acknowledge it with respect to the ecumenical movement as represented, say, by the World Council.

Religious journalists — and those who help them frame their policies — must accept and act upon what Henry Smith Leiper has written: "The world is one world, and Christendom is one Christendom. Christianity can have a decisive impact upon the world only if its scattered and divided forces speak with a united voice in those areas in which they are in substantial agreement."

DENOMINATIONAL PERIODICALS EXAMINED IN PREPARATION OF THIS ARTICLE
BY TYPE OF PUBLICATION AND NUMBER OF ISSUES READ

<i>Denomination</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>National General</i>	<i>Special</i>	<i>Local or Regional</i>
Associate Reformed Presbyterian	2	2	0	0
Baptist, Northern Convention	1	1	0	0
Baptist, Southern Convention	73	7	9	57
Church of God in North America	4	4	0	0
Church of the Nazarene	1	0	1	0
Congregational Christian	7	3	4	0
Cumberland Presbyterian	2	2	0	0
Disciples of Christ	4	0	4	0
Friends, Five Year Meeting	3	3	0	0
Free Methodist	5	4	1	0
Lutheran, American	3	3	0	0
Lutheran, Augustana	4	4	0	0
Lutheran, National Council	1	1	0	0
Methodist	45	7	9	29
Presbyterian, U.S.	10	9	0	1
Presbyterian, U.S.A.	7	7	0	0
Presbyterian, Orthodox	1	1	0	0
Protestant Episcopal	4	2	2	0
United Presbyterian	3	2	1	0
Universalist	4	4	0	0

CULTURAL PLURALISM IN THE AMERICAN TRADITION

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM
NORTHERN AND CENTRAL EUROPE

By WILLIAM W. SWEET

THE immigration to America during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century is usually termed the "old immigration." It was largely a movement of the same main racial stocks that were already to be found in the United States at the end of the Colonial period; namely Irish, English, Scotch, Germans, and Scandinavians. With the exception of the Irish this immigration was still predominantly of a Protestant complexion, though it has been estimated that a third of the Germans who came after 1830 were of Catholic background.

I

The great German tide set in after 1830, and from 1845 to 1860 it had become a veritable flood. During this period 1,250,000 Germans arrived. Lovers of the land, generally pretty well supplied with resources, they came West and their instinct for the soil led them to select fertile farms in the states of the Old Northwest and on into Missouri and Iowa. The skilled workers among them and the intellectuals were attracted to the growing central Western cities, and in Cincinnati, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and numerous smaller cities of the Northwest, German was for a time almost as common a language as English. Indeed there was considerable talk of establishing a separate German state and Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri were considered as possible sites for a Germany in America. Though for three generations their German churches, parochial schools, *Turnvereins*, musical clubs, picnics, and beer gardens kept them apart; yet they had no love for the Germany they had left and consequently no desire to return. Coming to the raw new West they introduced the seeds of artistic appreciation, and their respect for education influenced the rising new state universities. Among them were able leaders, imbued with democratic ideals, of whom Carl Schurz is an example, though by no means an isolated one; there were many

others of his kind, men who considered it an honor and a privilege to be American citizens. Many, however, looked upon these newcomers as enemies of the true America, because of their introduction of the Continental Sunday with its accompanying beer drinking and picnic excursions and other Old World practices out of harmony with Puritanical ideas and practices.¹

The last phase of German immigration began about 1870 and continued to the opening of the first World War. This immigration outnumbered all others: from 1870 to 1910 three and three quarters millions of Germans arrived. They were to a larger degree industrial workers than the earlier German immigrants had been; and though many took up lands in Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, they more and more tended to the cities where they found employment in factories and in those trades in which Germans excel. Many, if not a majority, of these later Germans came imbued with *der Deutsche Geist* and tended to be contemptuous and critical of everything in their new home. Those who came after 1900 generally refused to be naturalized and considered themselves German rather than American citizens. German propaganda financed from Germany attempted to bring every German church, school, club and newspaper into the service of the new Germany. The great majority of the people of the older German stock, however, were thoroughly out of sympathy with this program of Prussianization.

II

No immigration ever aroused more resentment and fear on the part of the older Americans than the transplanting of half the population of Ireland to America. It was the most poverty-stricken, illiterate, improvident immigration that had ever set foot on American soil. Entirely without resources, the Irish were compelled to settle down in the cities where they landed and their genius for organization and political manipulation soon gave them control of city governments in many cities along the Atlantic seaboard. By 1860 the total Irish population in the United States was 1,611,304, and since 1820 four and a quarter millions of Irish immigrants found their way to our shores. Practically a hundred percent Roman Catholic, a large percentage remained true to that faith, and today the Roman Catholic Church in America is largely manned by the Irish element. The Irish-American has largely retained his anti-English attitude.

"Wherever the human touch is the essential of success, there you find the Irish." In not a few great cities half the teachers are Irish; "they are the most successful walking delegates, solicitors, agents, foremen and contractors." Wherever dash, brilliance, cleverness, and emotion are demanded there you will find the Irish. They are numerously represented in the law, the priesthood, politics; journalism and literature attract them. In spite of all their faults and failings, America would not be America without them.

III

There are today in the United States at least four millions of people of Scandinavian blood — Swedes, Norwegians, Danes and Finns. This great exodus from Europe was motivated almost entirely by economic considerations. Coming largely from agricultural countries in the Old World, they tended to become farmers in the New World. In 1930 four-fifths of the American Swedes lived in rural communities and much the same proportion prevails also among the Norwegians, Danes and Finns. Practically a hundred percent Lutheran in background, they have transplanted their Lutheranism to America, though in America only a relatively small proportion have actually become communicants of churches. President Wentz states that only 30 percent of the Norwegians, 20 percent of the Swedes and 7 percent of the Danes are communicants of any church.² Members of the Lutheran state churches in their home lands, on coming to America most of them who have remained in the church are still Lutherans, though all of the American Scandinavian Lutheran churches have suffered schisms. Thus they have added to the religious complexity of the United States. According to the Religious Census of 1936 there are at least eight Scandinavian Lutheran churches in America, besides several non-Lutheran Scandinavian religious bodies.

Their industry, honesty, aptitude for agriculture, and instinct for self-government have enabled the Scandinavians to become almost at once valuable members of American society. They took an active part in forming local governmental units in the Dakotas and Minnesota and it was not long until they had able leaders in state and national affairs, not a few of whom have gained general recognition.³

The late Professor Orth has thus summarized the Scandinavian part in building modern America:

Without brilliance, producing few leaders, the Norseman represents the

rugged commonplace of American life, avoiding the catastrophes of a soaring ambition on the one hand and the pitfalls of a jaded temperamentalism on the other. Bent on self-improvement, he scrupulously patronizes farmers' institutes, high schools, and extension courses, and listens with intelligent patience to lectures that would put an American audience to sleep. This son of the North has greatly buttressed every worthy American institution with the stern traditional virtues of the tiller of the soil. Strength he gives, if not grace, and at a time when all social institutions are being shaken to their foundations.⁴

IV

The great inundation of immigrant peoples sweeping into the United States after 1880, largely from eastern and southern Europe, is generally characterized as the "new immigration" in contrast to what is called the "old immigration" from northern and western Europe. The new immigrants may also be appropriately designated as the "city builders," since a vast majority of them sought the cities. The mere listing of them fills one almost with dismay at the complexity of the problems which their presence among us causes.⁵

A million eight hundred thousand Czechs; 500,000 Slovaks; 3,400,000 Poles; Serbs, Montenegrins, Slovenes, Croats, and Dalmatians — many thousands of them (grouped, following World War I under the name Jugoslavs but in the United States maintaining their separate entities); 750,000 Russians; 500,000 Ukrainians or Ruthenians; 600,000 Hungarians; Bulgarians and Lithuanians, together 600,000; Latvians 40,000; five millions of Italians; 400,000 Greeks; more than 200,000 Armenians; 150,000 Portuguese and a million Mexicans; besides Chinese, Japanese, and four millions of Jews from the four corners of the earth. Such is the "new immigration."

The "new immigration" as did the "old" added greatly to the religious diversity of America, and tested to the full, from the beginning, the greatest of our freedoms — religious liberty. The Czechs were divided between Catholics and non-Catholics, and many are unchurched, while freethinkers' organizations are still numerous among them. The Czechs have broken from Catholicism far more than any other Slavic group in America. Lutheranism is relatively strong among American Slovaks, though they have remained Catholic to a larger degree than the Czechs. Numerous American denominations have also been active among both groups. Lithuanians are about 80 percent Catholic and 10 percent Lutheran; Latvians are about three fourths Protestant and about 19 percent Catholic. Among the Poles the

Roman Catholic Church plays the leading role, both religiously and as a social agency. They have retained their Old World religious affiliations more fully than any other group in the "new immigration," though they frequently express opposition to the Irish control of American Catholicism. Hungarians are divided between Catholics and Protestants, with the Protestants probably in the majority. The Hungarian Reformed Church, now a part of the Evangelical and Reformed Church in America, has the largest number of parishes, though there are also numerous Baptists and Presbyterians. The American Italians have retained to a larger degree their Catholic affiliation, though there has been a considerable drift away from Rome both into Protestant bodies, and to a larger extent, into irreligion.

The "new immigration" brought to America strong Eastern Orthodox elements, represented by the Greeks, the Russians, the Bulgarians, the Ukrainians, the Rumanians, the Serbians, together with a number of Roman Catholic Churches of the Greek rite. Practically all Greeks in America consider themselves members of the church and they represent the largest number among the Eastern Orthodox bodies. The Russian Orthodox are numerically in second place.

V

Only a brief characterization of the type of contribution which the new immigration has made to our culture is possible here. Many, such as the Poles, the Slovaks, the Russians, and the Italians are still overwhelmingly engaged in unskilled labor. Other groups, such as the Greeks, who came as laborers, soon graduated into proprietors of small business enterprises. Of all the southern Europeans, they seemed to be the most individualistic and aggressive, and will succeed where conditions permit individual effort. The Armenians have gone into business and into the professions more largely in proportion to their numbers than others. In all of our large cities you will find Armenians in the oriental rug business in which they have gained an international reputation. In business, in the professions, in philanthropy, and in education and scientific research, the Jews have made rich contributions.

The Jews, who constitute today one of the major religious groups in America, are 99 percent city dwellers. Aside from their religious significance, the Jewish congregations carry on charitable and social work among their own people both here and abroad. But their philan-

thropy is by no means limited to the Jewish people. The work carried on by the Rosenwald Foundation for the Negro is a notable example. Their aid to immigrants has been large and effective, not only in a material way but also in preparing them for citizenship.⁶

Perhaps in no realm has the contribution of the southern European been more conspicuous than in music and art. The Germans among the earlier immigrants really laid the foundation for orchestral music in America when in 1848 the Germania Orchestra began to give concerts in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Boston. In later years the Czechs, Poles, Italians, and Russians came more and more to fill places in orchestras once monopolized by the Germans. In 1930 the 114 members of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra included seventy-two naturalized citizens and twelve aliens. Among the naturalized members were twenty-nine Russians, one Spaniard, thirteen Italians, two Austrians, four Hungarians and ten Germans. Other large city orchestras in the United States are not greatly different in their personnel. In opera, America is equally indebted to the Southern European. Their contributions to other forms of American art, while not as large as in music, yet are impressive. This is indicated by the fact that in Van Dyke's *American Painting and Its Tradition* about half the painters listed are of mixed blood.

VI

The process of the peopling of modern America constitutes an amazing story. Any consideration of the complexity of the population of the United States throughout our history naturally gives rise to the question, "Is the United States a real nation?" A nation has been defined as "the political unity of people." How is this political unity to be secured and do we have such unity in America today?

Is racial unity a necessity for political unity? If so, then the United States is not a nation today, nor can it become a nation until complete amalgamation is secured.

Is unity of language necessary for the achievement of national unity? If so, then we are not a real nation. Today there are more foreign language newspapers published in the United States in proportion to the part of the population which read them, than in all Europe.

Is unity of religion a necessity for securing national unity? It was once so considered. If it were a necessity then we can never become a

nation until we give up the basic freedom of all our freedoms, the freedom of conscience.

The attempt to enforce religious unity has led to untold suffering and persecution in the long past. Such attempts have not been a monopoly of any one religious body. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews have all been guilty, at one time or another, of attempting to maintain religious unity by force. The chief thing these attempts have had in common was the injustice, the cruelty, and the suffering which they entailed. If religious unity is a necessity for national unity then the United States is farther from it than any other nation in the world. According to the last Federal Religious Census there are 256 independent religious bodies in the United States, every one of which, from the smallest to the largest, enjoys equal rights and privileges under the law.

But if we *are* a real nation what is it that makes us one?

1. An absolute necessity in the achievement of nationality is *common experience*. A nation, like an individual, is the product of experience. We are a united people in spite of our differences, because we are agreed about certain great ideas and ideals, one of which is religious freedom. Americans as a whole believe in "living and letting live" religiously. And there is nothing more un-American than for any one religious body even to dream of eventually controlling the religious life of America through the medium of legal restrictions. We have come to this position as a result of our experience.

We Americans have just completed a great common enterprise. The prosecuting of the war brought us all together. A common purpose made us one. Though we worshipped in different ways, got our news from newspapers published in all the languages under the sun, yet we stood shoulder to shoulder in carrying through one all-absorbing task.

2. A second necessity in the achievement of national unity is *common memories*. Common experience today will make for common memories tomorrow. History has been defined as the memory of a people. Memories of common triumphs to rejoice in; common sorrows and common problems faced; indeed common disasters are often more powerful in their influence in creating a feeling of unity than common joys. It was the half-century of bitter suffering and loss in their long struggle against the Spaniard which welded the Dutch people into a nation.

3. Though we may not be bound together by a long common past we all believe in a common future, in the building of which we can all have a part.

Recent studies have shown that the real source of much of our racial hostility is not physical but cultural.⁷ The remedy for this, however, is not the obliteration of all cultural differences, but rather the blending of all that is best from all cultures. And no nation in the world has such an opportunity as has ours in the achievement of this goal.

REFERENCES

1. Samuel P. Orth, *Our Foreigners* (New Haven, 1921), chap. VI, "The Teutonic Tide." See also Carl Wittke, *We Who Built America* (New York, 1939), chap. 9, "The Germans."
2. Abdel R. Wentz, *The Lutheran Church in American History* (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 222.
3. K. C. Babcock, *The Scandinavian Element in the United States* (New York, 1914).
4. Samuel P. Orth, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
5. Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek (editors), *Our Racial and National Minorities, Their History, Contributions and Present Problems* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 236-41.
6. See *ibid.*, chap. IX, "Jewish Americans," pp. 406-25.
7. M. F. Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York, 1942), especially chap. 10, "Race and Culture."

RELIGION AND MORALITY

By W. NORMAN PITTENGER

A STORY will be useful as a beginning for discussion of the subject of this paper. One day, runs the tale, a Protestant minister and a Roman Catholic priest met on a village street. In the course of their conversation it developed that they had different ideas of their ministerial function, expressed in the two phrases attributed to them. "My job," said the Protestant, "is to try to make good people religious." "Mine," said the Roman Catholic, "is to try to make religious people good."

Now however one may like or dislike the particular distribution of terms in this story, the point which it makes is a useful one. That point is, that there is a real distinction between religion and morality. The fact of the distinction is frequently obscured, especially in a religion like Christianity, in which the moral consequences of religion are so integral to the whole picture that they are sometimes identified with the thing itself. But the fact is there, and it needs to be stressed, although we ought never to be satisfied with an unethical religion or with an irreligious morality.

I

In a day now somewhat long past, there was a movement for the re-writing of the creeds in what were called "moral terms." It was felt that the ancient creedal formulae were unfortunate in that they did not stress sufficiently the ethical element in religion. But Dr. William Temple, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in discussing this idea, gave the proper answer when he said that a creed which was concerned with ethics would be a creed that developed hypocrites — people who claimed moral goals which in fact they did not attain. The function of a creed, he remarked, was to state the revelation of God and our belief in it; the ethical consequences should follow as a matter of course, but they were not part of religious belief *as such*.

Likewise, long before Temple's comment, the great Von Hügel, in his discussion of the nature of religion, protested that it was concerned with "isness," not with "oughtness," with the fact of God and the recognition of God by his creatures and not with their moral obliga-

tions in the light of that fact and its recognition. Morality, he insisted, is different from religion, although in the highest religions it is closely connected with and inescapably involved in the properly religious life. Religion is primarily "adoration"; morality is primarily "obligation."

Nor does such a position for a moment militate against the assumption that the divine judgment of man is in terms of man's total behavior, rather than of man's specific religious response. Doubtless religion is not important to God in himself; *he* does not have one! Hence he must and will judge men pre-eminently in their moral life, its integrity, purity, and reality. But for us men, religion is very important; *we* must have one. We must have one, because the condition of our sane, wholesome living — and hence, of our moral behavior — is an attitude towards, an apprehension of, and a place in, the total scheme of things such as will give meaning and dignity to human existence. And this religion, in the long run, is alone able to give.

II

There is a very immediate and practical reason for this insistence on the distinction between religion and morality — a reason which ought to be obvious in our own day. For a long time, now, the ordinary American has tended to identify Christianity with a certain ethical standard. It has broken down into two kinds of morality: one is the rather negative ethic of an older generation, but still a powerful force. Some one has characterized it as the "Don't drink — don't smoke — don't dance morality." The other is the positive but somewhat general morality of a younger generation, a morality which might be characterized as the "Do-good-and-serve-others morality."

But vast numbers of folk are unable to accept the first, at least in its obvious negative sense, while towards the second they have the attitude of admiring its intention but wondering about its actual helpfulness in concrete situations. In either case, they have so identified this morality with Christianity that they feel that if they cannot actually attain to an ethical standard which is, as they believe, demanded thereby, they have no right to have a religion at all, or at least to be Christian. Furthermore, they criticize those who are members of the religious communions on the ground that they do not fully manifest the moral standard which is, supposedly, *identical* with Christianity itself. And professing Christian people are themselves dubious, now and again, as to whether they have any right to continue

as Christians, when their behavior is all too often below that which ideally is required of them.

It is plain to any historian of religion that the general idea of religion in America is of the "sect" rather than the "church" type, to use Troeltsch's convenient distinction. It is the idea that religion is for the special and holy *few*, who are perfect followers of their chosen way, rather than for the sinful *many*, who may find help towards goodness and incentive towards moral effort within a fellowship that comes into being on other grounds. The latter, or "church" view, regards the Christian fellowship not as "a museum for saints," but as "a hospital for sinners," as the old slogan puts it. The former makes moral perfection, or the near achievement of it, an implied *condition* of membership, even if in recent times the ideal has broken down and "the saints" seem fewer in number!

III

Historically, it seems there can be no question that Christianity down the ages has not been in the first instance a moral system. Morality has been extremely important, but the *first* emphasis has been put elsewhere. Christianity has been a *religion*, centering about the action of God in Jesus Christ; the response in faith and worship to that figure; the dedication of life to him and the empowering of life by him; the transfiguration of personality by his active love and the establishment of a hope for continued personal existence because of his victory over death and sin. It has been a religion embodied in a community, by which the action of God in Christ has been extended down the centuries and made a vital factor for succeeding generations. It has been a religion in which, therefore, community replaces "solitariness," for which the Bible itself has been a parable, — for it begins with man alone in a garden and ends with man in a city, as one of a company of redeemed brethren.

The result of this religion, in its communal expression, has been a morality that is both humanist and rigorist, both generous and exacting. But the general trend of the Christian movement has been to find the Christian ethic a real and practicable one for men in the degree to which they have truly and whole-heartedly "belonged" to the fellowship, and not *vice versa*. As Dr. Fosdick once expressed it, Christianity has historically said that "we *ought*, because we *are*." We ought to act like Christians, because by the divine action we have become

and now are Christians — that is, we are of the company of disciples and servants of the Lord Jesus Christ.

IV

I am not merely inclined to think, I am in fact thoroughly convinced, that so far as the questing, ill-adjusted, unsatisfied youth of our land are concerned, they will be won to Christianity by this kind of approach rather than by the strictly ethical one. For those within the Christian fellowship, on the other hand, a stirring to action of a moral sort is essential. *They* need to be roused to a realization of the ethical demands of the faith they profess and the worship they offer. But for the others, our primary task is to present Christianity as a faith, a religion, which makes sense of life, gives dignity to life, provides power for life. We should welcome them into the fellowship, not because they are morally good but because they are religiously lost. We should preach our faith as God's gospel of deliverance from alienation, loss; the assurance that "underneath are the everlasting arms" and the promise that "all shall be well," as Mother Julian of Norwich said, because "God made, God loves and God keeps" his world. And then, when we have so won them, we should be rigorous in the moral demands which our faith makes, but also humanist in recognizing that men are weak and not only may but will sin, as things are — or, in our own terms, that they will often fail to achieve the normal kind of living which is natural to "the man in Christ."

We have long been delivered from the idea that *ecclesiasticism* is the Christian religion, although we now know that the *ecclesia*, the Church, is fundamental to it. We have lately been delivered from the idea that *Biblicism* is the Christian religion, although we all know that the Bible is the central, classical, and normative expression of our faith, in terms of its origin and formative days. We ought also to be delivered from the idea that *ethicism* is the Christian religion, even while we insist that a wide and high and deep morality is involved in Christianity.

V

All men are *implicitly* religious, even if they do not possess in a marked degree the so-called "religious instinct." By this I mean that all men have a desire to "make sense" of their lives, to ground their being upon the "unconditioned," to be related to the fundamental

drive in the universe. They may not express this in narrowly religious ways; it is, none the less, the only adequate explanation of their behavior and labor, as Dr. Tillich has so admirably shown in *The Religious Situation*. On the other hand, men do not naturally and immediately (apart from the religious community) achieve a morality which is consonant with high religion. That is why the Roman priest's remark — at the beginning of this essay — is more accurate than the Protestant minister's: "My job," he said, "is to try to make religious people good." There is no reason whatever that the Roman Catholic Church should claim this exclusively, however. *All* high religion, Catholic and Protestant, is or ought to be in a like case. The job of the minister is *first* of all to introduce men to God in his holiness, his love, and his forgiveness. *Then*, and only then, can he rightly and intelligibly talk about moral requirements made by that God. For then, and only then, is the context right for such requirements. It is to those of us who are *within the community* that the moral imperative needs to be preached; but it will not have much effect upon us if we are without some real and basic religious adjustment.

Furthermore, it is of the essence of the life of a religious tradition to be a life "in discipline." That is, ascetical theology and its practical implications are an integral part of the whole Christian — as of every other — religious complex. This is why in the Roman Catholic and other Catholic communions, with whatever abuses, the sacrament of penance or absolution has been central; it is also why the Methodists were strongest when they had the old "class meeting," why the Oxford Groups rediscovered the practice of confession, and why all vital religion has been concerned to recognize men to be sinners, to encourage them to confess the fact, and to give them strength to begin again and again the moral life which their faith demands but their practice so sadly fails to achieve in its fullness. A distinguished Protestant minister in New York has said frankly that, for want of some such contemporary discipline, vast numbers of religious people are frustrated and "beaten" in their lives. On the other hand, for want of a religious orientation, the moral struggle of the professed "humanist" becomes in its way a frustration, too. The increasing interest in "religion and health," as Dr. Seward Hiltner shows in his recent article in *The American Scholar* (summer, 1946), illustrates this admirably.

No matter how carefully one guards oneself, misunderstanding is always possible in a discussion of this sort. Therefore let me conclude

by saying that I am not for a moment denying the moral demands of Christianity, nor suggesting that they are unimportant or negligible. I am insisting on something quite different, something about which Kierkegaard had much to say that is invaluable for us. The Christian faith comes *first*; the morality of the Christian tradition comes *second*. But the second is a *real* second; it comes *directly* after the first. When Kierkegaard remarked that the religious category "dethrones" the ethical (and the aesthetic), he did not mean that it annihilated it. It appears that some folk cannot understand the difference between the two! He meant precisely what he said: that religion is primary, with morality as an utterly essential corollary. For a Christian, anyway, there can be no unethical religion nor irreligious morality, as we said at the beginning. The writer of Hebrews put it, with the proper order of things: "The God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

CONTEMPORARY BOOKS

ECUMENICITY FROM THE INSIDE

TOWARD A UNITED CHURCH, by WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN. *Charles Scribner's Sons*, \$2.50.

IT seems highly appropriate that the most comprehensive outline history of the modern ecumenical movement should have been the last work of one who himself gave so much to it as did William Adams Brown. The unfinished manuscript found among Dr. Brown's literary remains has been edited and completed by his pupil and friend, Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert. Together with an elaborate and useful bibliography it forms the best compact source of authentic information concerning the antecedents and development of the World Council of Churches.

After a brief chapter defining the terminology of the modern movement for Christian unity, there follows an outline of the history of the movement, which is distinguished, according to Dr. Brown, by the place which it makes for "independence both of thought and action in its program for the future." Not conformity but co-operation and community of interest are the key to that unity which is sought through the ecumenical movement of our time. It manifested itself in what are described as "converging lines of preparation" in the Evangelical Alliance, the World's Student Christian Federation, and the missionary enterprise, as well as in the movement for a social application of the gospel. "Faith and Order" and the development of federation were outgrowths of the root idea. It is for the future to determine whether the Faith and Order element in the ecumenical movement will be able to persuade the Churches to surrender the total sovereignty of each (which federation preserves) and thus to emphasize organic union as well as spiritual unity.

Chapters four, five, six, and seven tell the story of the world conferences which have led most directly to the formation of the World Council beginning with the Ecumenical Conference held in New York in 1900 and coming down to the Oxford, Edinburgh and Madras Conferences of 1937-38. The author includes in each case a brief appraisal of the contribution which each of these notable gatherings made to the growth of the idea of unity, and admirably recalls the atmosphere of each, so that interest in personalities is added to interest in ideas. He makes much of the ways in which the modern missionary movement developed within the younger Churches the dynamic of unity which has made itself felt throughout the Western world. This came to unique and moving expression at Madras in 1938. There the leaders of the younger Churches pled eloquently with the older

Churches to realize that unity in the Orient was a matter of life and death — and was often held back merely by the attitudes of the older Churches of the Occident.

With chapter eight the author comes to deal specifically with the way in which the lines of development he has been describing meet in the World Council of Churches. Little-known portions of the story are here told and the main steps made clear. It is not generally known, one feels sure, that the name "World Council of Churches" was first suggested by Dr. Cavert at one of the Bishophthorpe conferences promoted by Dr. Brown and called by Dr. William Temple, then Archbishop of York. A section of this chapter deals with the basis of the World Council and records the author's conviction that the phrase "Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour" would have been rejected by any one of the Ecumenical Councils of the early Church because "it expressed only half of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, namely, the deity of Christ, while his complete humanity is an equally essential doctrine." Dr. Brown reiterates his judgment, expressed at Utrecht that the phrase "God incarnate," had it been used, would more accurately have described the faith of the undivided Church. Had he lived he would doubtless have raised the issue at the first Assembly of the Council.

The final chapters deal respectively with the story of how the ecumenical movement met the test of war and of how the movement appears today in the perspective of history. These conclude the work of Dr. Brown's pen. The Epilogue is written by Dr. Cavert and is followed by a selection of recent official documents of the Christian Unity movement and a bibliography.

HENRY SMITH LEIPER

INTERPRETING AMERICAN RELIGION TO THE BRITISH

RELIGION IN AMERICA, by WILLARD L. SPERRY. *The Macmillan Co.* \$3.50.

SOME nine years ago this reviewer had the pleasant and profitable experience of spending a part of a sabbatical year in Cambridge, England. Shopping around among the distinguished lecturers at the University, especially in the field of history, I noted that there were no courses offered in the field of American history, though there were more than twenty courses available in the various phases of English history and all other historical fields were well covered. During that same year a series of letters appeared in the *London Times* calling attention to the neglect of American studies, especially literature and history, in the English schools generally and in the ancient universities particularly. While Oxford has had an

intern professorship of American history for the past several decades, Cambridge has only very recently taken steps in the direction of remedying this strange omission. Such neglect of things American in the English schools and universities is both a cause and a symptom of the general lack of knowledge of American life and institutions which prevails among the mine-run of Englishmen. This situation, now increasingly deplored on both sides of the Atlantic, has long called for some adequate correction.

The Cambridge University Press has undertaken to help remedy this unfortunate lack of information by publishing a series of volumes explaining American institutions to the British public. The first of the series to appear is Dean Willard L. Sperry's *Religion in America*, which made its appearance in an English edition last autumn and received high praise from its English reviewers. The present volume, the American edition, is published without change except for a brief additional Foreword. In this the author calls to the attention of his American readers that the volume was meant "to be read at a distance" and the intention was to explain our religious situation to our English friends and not to Americans. The style is deliberately informal; the author justifies this on the ground that America is an informal country and that to have it dressed up to "go abroad" would have been to make it a "false transcript" of American life. This easy and often brilliant informality together with its wealth of allusion makes the book delightful reading. While some of its readers on this side of the Atlantic will doubtless take exception to several of the generalizations and appraisals, and to the unequal distribution of space given to the great Protestant bodies in contrast with the prominence given the "sects," as well as to the use of a single Catholic source in the chapter on American Catholicism, yet there can be no doubt as to the astuteness of the author's observations and interpretations and the over-all success of the volume in achieving what he set out to do.

Of the thirteen chapters, the first, "Presuppositions," and the last, "Second Thoughts," are interpretative. The emphasis throughout is upon the differences between the religious life of England and that of America, rather than upon their likenesses. Of these differences, the most important, the author rightfully holds, is the total absence in the United States of anything like an establishment. A second basic difference is the rank individualism in religion prevalent in America; a third is the "immense and indomitable optimism" which is characteristic of all of American life; and the final difference is the fact that religion has a larger hold on America than on European countries. Of the other eleven chapters three deal largely with colonial background; two with the causes for the welter of denominations prevailing in America; while the remaining six deal topically with the parish church, American theology, religious education, the Negro

church, Roman Catholicism, and church union. The necessity of treating the Negroes and Catholics in separate chapters is self-evident. The chapter on the Negro church is appreciative and understanding, and will doubtless be a revelation not only to English readers but to many Americans as well. Though, in the chapters on the denominations, some attention is given the Jews it might have been well to have given them a fuller treatment in a separate chapter because of their growing importance and the special nature of their contribution to American life. Throughout these chapters there is always just enough history to clarify the present situation but never enough to clutter the narrative.

The fact that Dean Sperry had a part of his education at Oxford and has had numerous long periods of residence in England gives his authorship of this explanatory volume particular fitness. The fact that he has lived his entire mature life in the most Catholic part of America and along the Atlantic seaboard may help explain his failure to stress the importance of middle America and the frontier influence in the Americanizing process. To this reviewer this seems to be the most serious omission.

The eight appendices prepared by Mr. Ralph Lazzaro, instructor in church history in Harvard Divinity School, are a most important part of this book especially for its English readers. Indeed they constitute a veritable mine of well-arranged and revealing information about the religious bodies in the United States.

WILLIAM W. SWEET

THE PRIMACY OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

DIE THEOLOGIE DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS, by ETHELBERT STAUFFER. Geneva: Oekumenischer Rat der Kirchen, mit Beihilfe des Kohlhammer Verlags, Stuttgart. 1945.

ESPECIAL interest attaches to this product of the war years of German scholarship. The author, a professor at Bonn, is known particularly for his contributions to the *Kittel Wörterbuch*. The close relation of Biblical theology to the heroic testimony of the Continental churches; the vigorous life of this discipline abroad — and the contrasting scepticism of American scholarship with regard to it; Dr. Visser 't Hooft's indication of the importance of the work on the occasion of his visit to this country last year — all these factors arouse great anticipation in the reader. The anticipations are not disappointed. It is particularly gratifying to find that the work conveys to us not only an exposition of the theology of the New Testament but also an extensive supporting documentation, rich in illuminating New Testament scholarship. Furthermore the position of the work sets it apart from those emphases, whether the results of "pneumatic" or dialectical

interpretation, which have had so many elements of the arbitrary and the unhistorical.

The dominant emphasis of the work appears in the following characterization of the theological thinking of the primitive church:

God has ordered all reality historically. It is in this sense that *Geschichtstheologie* is the canonical *Urform* of Christian thinking and of all systematic theology. Any given (such as man, the state, the Torah) is theologically understood when its place in this historical order of reality is defined.

It follows that, from the point of view of the New Testament, revelation comes through historical events. God's way is to be recognized in the historical-eschatological process. Any revelation of God in creation is subordinate to this. And in any case a just recognition by man of creation, i.e., nature, is only possible in the light of the New Creature.

Throughout the work the author sets up the corrective of the New Testament outlook and its "scandal" against recurrent trends in the church. This is largely tacit, but at times the author concludes explicitly as in the following.

The decisive content of the primitive Christian preaching of the word is not a gospel of the love of God and man (Harnack), nor a gospel of the holy God who condescends to the sinner (Holl), but the gospel of the Christ-event. At the beginning of the history of the church is not only an event related to the history of culture, nor one related to the history of revelation, but one related to the history of salvation: the way on earth of the Son of God in the service of the world's extremity.

The book has two parts, first an exposition of the thought world of the New Testament (pp. 1-234), and second, "a work-book to lead the student into the workshop of New Testament research" (pp. 235-312 and addenda). The arrangement of the body of the work is of great interest since controversy as to the presentation of Biblical theology has been vigorous. Stauffer abandons both the presentation in terms of books or figures (Jesus, Paul, etc.) as well as that in terms of doctrines (God, man, etc.). The matter is ordered in terms of the world process, in which the *Heilsgeschichte* or history of salvation has its place. The five main sections are entitled: (1) Creation and Fall, (2) Law and Promise, (3) The Christ-Event, (4) Church and World-Process, (5) Present and Future. To these are added a series of valuable studies on the confessional formulae of the primitive church. Scholars will find this section, as well as the addenda, of the most intense interest.

A highly significant scholarly presupposition of the work is stated at the outset. We often note the large place that the Old Testament in its Septuagint form has in the New Testament. Alongside of the Old Testament

citations, however, we find fragments of non-canonical works. It is the outlook of these recent Jewish works which governs the interpretation of the Old Testament in the New Testament writings. The church lived and thought in a world of midrash and apocalyptic which had quite transformed either the Septuagint outlook on which it rested or any pagan sources from which it drew. Our recognition of this, says Stauffer, frees us at a stroke from the anarchy of the religious-historical method and permits us to concentrate upon the Jewish midrashic-apocalyptic thought world of the New Testament figures and writings.

This thought world was concerned not only with human history but with world history and the history of all spiritual beings. Emphasis is placed upon the prior divine purpose and predestination, upon the freedom, none the less, of all beings, upon the conflict theme involving Satan and the sin of men, upon Christ's role as cosmic protagonist and upon the teleological character of the world process and the consummation. A notable emphasis in the work falls upon the *Tiefenweg* of Christ, his passage through the depths, in which a threefold function was wrought out: in relation to God, the manifestation of his glory; in relation to Satan, victory; in relation to man, redemption. It is to be noted that the author is candid with the divergencies of the New Testament writings. Particularly rich is his documentation of the teachings from non-canonical works. Scholars will find a useful series of recent bibliographical references under each subhead.

The reader comes away from the book with a new sense of the strangeness of the New Testament thought world. But while Stauffer makes no concessions to modernization his treatment inevitably disturbs us with the thought that that alienness lies as much in our shallowness of experience and apprehension as in the details of the world view itself. If our corporate Christian experience were profound enough we would be driven to corresponding affirmations, having a corresponding scandal for the prevailing wisdom of men.

AMOS N. WILDER

A THEOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE GOSPELS

JESUS THE MESSIAH, by WILLIAM MANSON. *Westminster Press*. \$2.75.

THE subtitle of Dr. Manson's Cunningham Lectures reads: "The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ: with special reference to Form-Criticism." He endeavors "to show with what materials early Christianity, starting from the basis of its Messianic confession, built up its tradition of the revelation of God in Christ," assuming that "the historical events in which Christianity took its rise can be approached through the Synoptic tradition by a just and patient evaluation of the terms" (p. 202).

These "special events" are of paramount importance — the origin of Christianity was not an idea, but a life: hence the variety and even heterogeneity of testimony found in the records. Hence also the impossibility of short-circuiting the investigation by substituting historical intuition for patient research. And hence, likewise, the necessity of dealing with Form Criticism in its own special area, that of the oral tradition prior to the writing of the Gospels. The author deals very firmly with Professor Bultmann's views, and rejects many of them. In dealing with Bultmann, he has the advantage of sharing a similar theological position, viz., Neo-orthodoxy (see especially Chapter VIII), though his standpoint is more "orthodox" than "neo." There are some points at which many American Biblical scholars will find it difficult to follow him, chiefly in his dominantly *theological* approach to the whole subject. One may even ask if he himself, in unifying the records, has not substituted an idea for a Life.

Of great value is his recognition of the variety in outlook of the Synoptic tradition: here of course he is at one with the form critics. So is his interpretation of Mark as "a Gospel of the Signs of Jesus," and his handling of the problem raised by the contrast between Mark and Q, since the latter source emphasizes Jesus' teaching, not his "mighty works." And so too is his excellent discussion of our Lord's "extraordinary sense of mission," and also, finally, his treatment of the narratives of the Last Supper. It is only when he sets forth his reconstruction that serious difficulties and questions arise.

Dr. Manson assumes that the "Messianic" categories of Judaism were essentially one: the Davidic Prince, the Suffering Servant, and the Son of Man are really descriptions of the same Coming One. (See, e.g., p. 141, and Appendix C.) He does away with the "heavenly man redemption myth" of Reitzenstein's theory, and insists that Jewish Messianology *was* Jewish, fundamentally, and was rooted in the Old Testament. But he assumes that the various figures are all one, as against Gressmann's *Der Messias* (1929). Even the Suffering Servant in II Isaiah was a "Messianic" figure, though he does not go the length of Ludwig Köhler (whom he might have quoted), who in his *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (1936) held that this is almost the only Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament! His argument thus leads to the identification of the three figures, and presents us with a complex of ideas according to which from the time of II Isaiah it was expected that the Messiah would suffer and die and so "enter into his glory" — an idea that reminds us of the views of our own Professor Torrey (to whom Dr. Manson does not refer). The evidence for this identification is the use of similar terms to describe the three. But (1) these terms are conventional Old Testament, and even Oriental and Egyptian, terms for royalty and exaltation; (2) the Messianic interpretation of the Servant in II Isaiah

is very questionable — until the second century and later when, in Jewish exegesis, the prophecies of the Messiah had come to be understood as referring to the Jewish people, and hence the Messiah himself could be identified with the sublime symbolic figure of the Servant of Isaiah 53 (who had always symbolized Israel); (3) both the Targum (Appendix B) and the Midrash (p. 143) are late and post-Christian, and it is quite unsafe to cite them as proof of the existence of interpretations current in the Judaism of the first century. The Midrash on p. 143 explains all the texts quoted as referring to Israel, not the Messiah. See this and other passages in Strack-Billerbeck; *Kommentar z. N. T. aus Talmud und Midrasch* III, 15–22, on Romans 1:3. Further, (4) as Professor Sharman has shown in his *Son of Man and Kingdom of God* (1943), the concepts involved in the idealized figures of Son of Man and Suffering Servant are mutually exclusive — as are also those involved in Son of Man and Kingdom of God. Dr. Manson has taken no account of this recent and important American book.

This part of his case we must view as not proven. That is, the final solution of the problem, Did Jesus claim to be Messiah? has not yet been found. It is true that Jesus had a lofty conception of his mission, and thought of the coming full revelation of the Reign of God as somehow related to, in a sense dependent on, his own work of gathering disciples, teaching the Gospel, healing the sick, and destroying the works of the devil — though he did not put it that way. Instead, what he said was, “If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come.” It is true, he accepted life — and death — at the hands of God, utterly submissive to the divine will, and he no doubt found the meaning of his destiny foreshadowed in the prophets and the Psalms. He may even, perhaps, have understood the Suffering Servant as an individual figure belonging to the predicted future, and thus have applied the prophecy to himself. It is true, no doubt, that he used the term “the Son of Man” of himself — though whether in the exalted Danielic-Enochic sense or not is a question: the sources in Mark and Q are too uncertain, especially in Mark, where they occur in secondary strata. But this is not enough to justify the theory that all three, Son of God (or Messiah), Suffering Servant, and Son of Man, were identified in Jewish Messianic ideology, or were three aspects of one role which Jesus himself set out to fulfil. Instead, as many scholars hold, they may very well reflect three stages, or aspects, of the primitive Christian interpretation of Jesus — even the most primitive — and belong to the history of Christian thought at its earliest stage rather than to Jesus himself. To play a part, to play the role of any one of these, let alone of all three, seems histrionic and unreal, and not appropriate to the “mind of Christ” reflected elsewhere in the Gospels. That they are true categories, and reflect inspired insights into the meaning of Jesus’ person and work in the world, makes no difference: the

problem is inescapably historical, at this point, not theological. Fortunately, the truth of the revelation of God in Christ does not depend upon the proof that Jesus claimed to be Messiah, or Enochic Son of Man, or undertook to fulfil the role of the Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

IMPROVING WITHOUT RETHINKING FOREIGN MISSIONS

NEW BUILDINGS ON OLD FOUNDATIONS, by J. MERLE DAVIS. *International Missionary Council*, \$1.75 cloth, \$1.50 paper.

THIS book, fifth in a series of "Studies in the World Mission of Christianity," is intended, as its subtitle indicates, as a Handbook on Stabilizing the Younger Churches in their Environment. Its author, since 1928 Director of the Department of Social and Economic Research and Counsel of the International Missionary Council in Geneva, Switzerland, is surpassed by none in first-hand knowledge of world missions. He believes, heart and soul, in the missionary movement. But it has been his job to visit, to analyze, to appraise and to compare. And he does not hesitate to be critical.

Unlike *Rethinking Missions*, however, this book is philosophically and theologically "within the fold." It begins and ends with a personal declaration of faith in the Church of Christ as alone providing an adequate interpretation of life in the experience of God's saving grace through his Son, Jesus Christ (pp. 29 and 288). Even as it confronts the colossal failures of missions significantly to increase the numbers of its converts and of its self-supporting churches, it never questions its basic soundness but seeks instead by various devices to speed its ultimate success. This is altogether sound, within the limits set by the author. Such "new buildings" as it recommends are "on old foundations."

The salvation of the Younger Churches lies in the intelligent application of the methods of social anthropology to the mission field. For this brings an understanding of native standards both ethical and social and so provides a basis for co-operation, for a gradual and reasonable adjustment to the demands of Christian idealism, an adjustment that shall not be destructive of age-old controls except as newer and better ones may be substituted.

But beyond this change in missionary strategy the author urges yet another, the enlargement of the church's functioning to include an active concern in all that contributes to the enrichment of life. The two are of course closely related. "The land, the struggle for livelihood, the family, disease and death, fear of the unknown and of disaster, security in this life

and the life to come, the craving for contact with Divinity and the sense of failure are among the virtually universal points of contact with non-Christian peoples" (p. 55). And this insight so modifies the concept and orientation of the Christian program that "under this approach, evangelization is cure of sick bodies, of broken-down, inefficient, and eroded farms, of illiteracy, of insufficient and unbalanced diet, unsanitary homes, impure drinking water, of a subsistence level of existence, of filthy villages, of the moral, mental, and spiritual stagnation of corrupt practices and conditions. Every effort upon this wide and comprehensive front of Christian service is a part of the Evangel and is required to enable the individual to reach the fulness of the stature which is in Christ" (p. 233).

The fundamental mistakes in missionary strategy are thus revealed to be the failure really to understand and utilize the social and spiritual values inherent in native cultures and the error of believing that souls are saved and nations won to Christ except his love be exemplified through active concern with soil and sanitation, health, education, government, housing, and all the other factors which add up to misery and despair or to comfort and hope. And these mistakes more than any others account for the failure of the churches to become self-supporting and indigenous. They have failed adequately to adapt to native cultures and they have too narrowly interpreted salvation.

These judgments are splendidly supported both in logic and by example. Mr. Davis has appropriated to his use the keenest insights of the social anthropologists. He would find added support in the writings of the sociologists and social psychologists. His illustrations are apt and fascinating. He does not fail to quote exceptions to the general rule. His chapters on outstanding self-supporting churches and their methods are stimulating and encouraging.

His last chapters, though useful, are an anti-climax. They deal chiefly with methods of money-raising and especially of involving the congregation in the process. It is a bit ironical that, following hard upon his appeal for deference to native ways and customs, the author finds nothing to commend which bears any other stamp than that of our American churches with their varied schemes of self-support. These chapters do re-emphasize the awful prevalence of the tendency of missions boards to pauperize and pamper their converts.

Perhaps nothing the book offers the non-missionary reader is more valuable than the revelation of the universality of most of the issues with which it deals. How shall the church stand above the conflict and confusion of life to judge it and at the same time significantly share in it? How can the church serve to integrate a community's life when a majority are of other faiths? Has the church a unique function in social welfare even

where governmental and private agencies try to pre-empt the field? How develop leaders who will know how to share more fully and effectively with the members the tasks of administration and control?

This book will find wide use among missionaries and churchmen, at home and abroad.

ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR.

NIEBUHR THE PREACHER

DISCERNING THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES, by REINHOLD NIEBUHR. *Charles Scribner's Sons*, \$2.50.

TEN "Sermonic Essays" constitute this latest book from the pen of one of the great theologians of contemporary Christianity. Based on sermons preached in college and university chapels, they bring many of the keenest insights of his greatest work, *Nature and Human Nature*, to close grips with the immediate issues of our time. They are characterized by a refreshing clarity of expression, aided and abetted by many apt illustrations. To say that Dr. Niebuhr is a skillful preacher as well as a great theologian is not news to anyone who has heard him preach, and this volume will convey the same conviction to those who may not have had that privilege.

Some teachers of homiletics have been known to say that great preaching consists of three things: illustrations, more illustrations, and still more illustrations. That, at best, is a striking half-truth. Prior to any illustration, and determinative of it, are both a clear notion of the religious insight to be conveyed and a carefully tested rational conception of how best to do it. To place a number of striking illustrations in juxtaposition in a time sequence and call it a sermon ought to constitute grounds for justifiable homicide. Dr. Niebuhr's book will be accepted as required reading by every preacher who wants an excellent display of the kind of hard thinking which ought to go into the preparation of sermons. Though Dr. Niebuhr may have written these essays after the sermons were preached, the sensitive, disciplined thinking which shines through them was done long before he ever stepped into the pulpit.

So much for the truly fine "art" of the preacher as found in this book. The "matter," however, far outshines it, being in effect an effort to find in the Christian conception of God the true principle for interpreting human life and history. Dr. Niebuhr continues to employ his favorite logical device of "paradox" in expressing the conflicts and contradictions of life. There can be no doubt about the dramatic effect of paradox, especially when wielded by a master like the author, but serious doubt can be raised about its adequacy for expressing the fluid nature of life as well

as its validity as a logical form. After all, it is only one of several ways in which the facts of difference, conflict, and contradiction can be stated and interpreted. Some day, let us hope, Dr. Niebuhr will give us an explanation of his continued use of this particular logical form to the exclusion of others.

While it is presumptuous to try to express in a sentence or two the conclusions reached in these essays, their importance justifies one in making the attempt. Dr. Niebuhr leads off with the assertion that man's hypocrisy keeps him from discerning the signs of the times and that the only proper remedy is a rebirth of religious humility. This grows out of the confrontation of God in prayer, "the God who stands above (and in some sense against) all human judgments; who judges us even while we judge our foe; who completes the drama of history which we always complete falsely because we make ourselves, our culture, and our nation the premature center of its completion."

The second essay on "Anger and Forgiveness" is likely to occasion more controversy than any other. Beginning with the highly dubious assertion that "anger is the root of both righteousness and sin," it proceeds to the indubitable conclusion that religious humility is the only effective remedy for the sin in anger. Humility can keep anger from becoming hatred, from being selfish in nature, from being simple vindictiveness. But Dr. Niebuhr is clear on this: that anger has a high place in Christian ethics. Try fitting that into the Sermon on the Mount just anywhere and you will have an interesting time! But this same essay contains as realistic and sane a statement of the proper attitude toward the defeated nations in the last war as can be found anywhere.

Several essays, notably "Age Between the Ages," "The Nemesis of Nations," "The City Which Hath Foundations," and "Today, Tomorrow and the Eternal" are Dr. Niebuhr at his best both as an interpreter of the Bible and as a religious prophet. In all these essays the twin gifts of humility and faith are the great contributions of religion to the many problems discussed. The contradictions between our universal ideals like brotherhood and our sinful division of men into races, etc. is so glaring that the issue between moral cynicism and religious faith is fully joined. The former disbelieves in the reality of the ideals and the latter believes in them though not in their perfect realization here.

The most unusual essay is "Humour and Faith" based on the unique text, "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision" (Psalm 2:4). It develops that the divine laughter is occasioned by the "vast incongruity" of man's life, the wide chasm which separates his pretensions and his deeds, his claims to strength and wisdom over against his weakness, pride, and ignorance. But there is a point beyond

which the seriousness of the incongruities precludes laughter. Then faith steps in to give men the courage to face and manage the absurd contradictions of life. The essay closes with this matchless statement. "That is why there is laughter in the vestibule of the temple, the echo of laughter in the temple itself, but only faith and prayer, and no laughter, in the holy of holies."

The essay, "Mystery and Meaning," strikes me as being the best writing and clearest thinking in the entire book. It reflects the new appreciation of the quality of mystery which surrounds all that we are and know. As Dr. E. S. Ames says, "Every fact is fuzzy with mystery." Dr. Niebuhr moves with seven-league boots throughout the whole realm of nature, illustrating the fact that mystery and meaning go hand in hand everywhere and that, for religion, humility, and faith are the true ways of perceiving the deepest meanings of life.

The essay, "Power and Weakness of God," is a valuable approach to Dr. Niebuhr's conception of God, which he, understandably, does not attempt to argue in any detailed way. Those who accept his theology *in toto* will applaud it, I suppose, but it impresses me as being the most questionable bit of reasoning in the book. It adds up to this: "The crux of the cross is its revelation of the fact that the final power of God over man is derived from the self-imposed weakness of his love" (p. 134). This "self-imposed weakness" of God "is his final power" (p. 147). When we get to the point that "weakness" means "power" and vice versa, we need one of two things: either more words in the English language or another logical form than that of paradox for conveying the complicated meanings that swing dizzily from one term to the other.

The concluding essay, "The Peace of God," ought to be read as a necessary corrective by everyone who has been reading Rabbi Liebman's book, *Peace of Mind*. Dr. Niebuhr's grasp of the meaning of "peace" is much truer to the whole range of human experience and religious insight. The peace of God is the supreme blessing open to man because it enables him to live with himself, others, and in this world without losing courage and faith.

The most debatable concept in this book is "faith." It is the sword Dr. Niebuhr wields most vigorously when in trouble. It is his final answer to the paradoxes which his analytical skill and amazingly penetrating insight reveal. Actually, it is the one thing that keeps the logical device of paradox from collapsing into cynicism and skepticism. So far as "reason" sees, the opposites are balanced, but faith reaches out to God and finds in him a positive answer. But what is *faith*? How is it related to reason? Is it akin to the intuition of the artist? Is it primarily emotional in nature, a "hunch"? Is it like the sense of assurance which comes through conscience?

Until Dr. Niebuhr makes the same sustained effort to clarify the meaning of faith which Dr. Richard Kroner makes in his *The Primacy of Faith*, we can only hope that we understand what it is he means by it.

An unintentional but grave injustice is done to many great thinkers in this sweeping assertion. "The wise men of the world have always pictured God as dwelling in a supernal serenity, in an Olympian equanimity, untouched by the sorrows of the world and undisturbed by its tumult" (p. 177). I do not know precisely who these "wise men" are, but I do know that such men as Hegel, Bergson, S. Alexander, Whitehead, and Brightman are not among them. These men have as keen a sense of the tragedy of life as even Dr. Niebuhr — and that is high praise.

HAROLD BOSLEY

ORTHODOXY APPRAISES NEO-ORTHODOXY

THE NEW MODERNISM: AN APPRAISAL OF THE THEOLOGY OF BARTH AND BRUNER, by CORNELIUS VAN TIL. *Philadelphia, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., \$3.75.*

NOT since Dr. J. Gresham Machen's scholarly volume on *The Virgin Birth* has orthodox Protestantism in America come so ably to expression as in this book. The author is the professor of apologetics in Westminster Theological Seminary, an institution established under Dr. Machen's influence when he became convinced that theological learning at Princeton was unfaithful both to Scripture and to the Reformed tradition. Dr. Van Til is equally convinced that only as the Christian truth is pursued in the manner of Westminster can it be expounded and maintained. In this volume he continues the polemical fervor and intransigence that have come to be associated with Orthodoxy in American Protestantism.

But the polemics in this book are more than a Pharisaic inclination to confuse difference of mind with perversion of spirit. Dr. Van Til has brought to his discussion a vigorous and sustained analysis which brings the principal philosophical and theological presuppositions of modern culture under informed and thorough review. Orthodoxy in these pages has intellectual power in the grand style. And I am bound to say that they ought to be read by everyone who is seriously concerned about Christian doctrine and the intellectual climate in which that doctrine must be set forth today. For Dr. Van Til has given us a trenchant and arresting analysis of the present predicament of the Christian mind. He forces us to face squarely the metaphysical and epistemological presuppositions that determine theological thinking and he compels us not only to choose between one metaphysic and another, but to decide between the Christian revelation and any metaphysic at all.

Modern thought, according to the author of this book, has been dominated by successive waves of anti-metaphysical attempts to account for *what* and *how* it knows. The critical philosophy of Kant, the dialectical efforts of Hegel and Kierkegaard, and the existential movement of the German phenomenologists and Heidegger have all denied the notion of "antecedent Being" as the basis for the identity between reality and truth. These movements have proceeded instead from the "autonomous individual" and have failed to establish adequate certainty about what really "is," and its relation to what may be known. They have all surrendered to the paradox of an irrationalism of "purest contingency" according to which "brute fact," or "the Moment," or "the individual" is completely isolated from a knowable order of reality, in contrast with a rationalism of "purest, abstract logic" according to which general propositions or descriptions or interpretations are made. There is in short an "absolute contrast between logic and existence." "Meaning" replaces "consistency" as the ultimate problem of truth. And meaning is a matter of ceaseless growth; never a matter of what really *is*.

Barth and Brunner are to be understood as the products of these influences. An exhaustive analysis of their writings is undertaken to show that, in spite of their emphasis upon the Word of God, upon Biblical revelation, and upon Christ as mediator and Lord, they are actually unable to do more than verbalize the great Christian doctrines because the presupposition of all their thinking is the fateful paradox of modern thought and not at all the Christianity of the Bible and the Reformation. The Reformed faith, according to Dr. Van Til, is significantly defined by two doctrines both of which are denied by the dialectical theologians. The first is the doctrine of "the self-contained ontological Trinity," and the second is the doctrine of "direct historical revelation." Barth and Brunner are unable to accept these doctrines because of their repeated insistence that nothing in nature, history, or human experience *in fact* gives us clear knowledge of God, and because they really "have no room for the idea of a finished revelation that is given to man by a self-subsistent God." Consequently the dialectical theology is not "neo-orthodox" at all but a new and more dangerous "modernism," which while it has seemed to oppose the "consciousness theologians" of the last century, is really and ruthlessly directed against orthodoxy as the bitter enemy.

Now the Achilles' heel of this highly sophisticated and elaborate argument is not the author's definition of "modernism" but his definition of "orthodoxy." Dr. Van Til adroitly shifts the ground of debate from the point at which orthodoxy has hitherto stubbornly insisted upon it, namely the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, and rests his case instead upon the role of metaphysics in theology. Thus, as he states the

case, the trouble with Barth and Brunner and the whole of modern thought is the rejection of the doctrine of "antecedent Being." And, conversely, it appears that the real claim of orthodoxy to validity is that its doctrine of the Trinity and of revelation are based upon an ontology which solves the problem of knowledge in relation to existence. The author nowhere tells us that his real reliance is on classical metaphysics. He only reproaches the modern mind for being anti-metaphysical. But are the Bible and Calvin really Aristotelian, or even Platonist; rather than Cartesian, or even Kantian? The answer is plain. The Bible and the Reformers are neither metaphysical nor anti-metaphysical. They are concerned not with "the self-contained ontological Trinity" but with the act of God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ. And the Bible and the Reformers are neither historical nor anti-historical in terms of the question whether God is directly or indirectly known in nature or in history as such. If Dr. Van Til had paused to read Luther and to remember what he must have read in Calvin, he would know that the problem of the Reformers is exactly the problem of the Bible, — not how *man* may know *God* but how *sinful* man may know that he has been *redeemed*.

These concerns are exactly what Barth and Brunner have charged both modernism (better known as liberalism) and Dr. Van Til's kind of orthodoxy (better known as fundamentalism) with ignoring. Perhaps they have succeeded better than they knew in shattering the Scriptural security of the orthodox and demonstrating the historical insecurity of modernism. Otherwise, why should Dr. Van Til be shifting his ground from Scripture to history just when modernism is beginning again to move from history to the Scriptures? If orthodox and modernist alike would really reflect upon this book, the former might be moved to read Barth and Brunner, and to discover that Dr. Van Til has falsely arraigned them as enemies, while the latter might be moved to *re-read* Barth and Brunner and to discover that they have falsely arraigned them as not being friends. Thus it could come about that a book, whose polemics are intended to divide the church, has inadvertently contributed to ecumenical integrity and sobriety by sharpening the critical issue of the true relation between the unity of the Church and the Bible.

PAUL LEHMANN

PRACTICALITY, HUMOR AND SAINTHOOD

MOTHER OF CARMEL, by E. ALLISON PEERS. *Morehouse-Gorham Co.*, \$2.20.

ONLY two years after Allison Peers' most useful study of St. John of the Cross (*Spirit of Flame*) he has written a companion volume of at least equal quality on St. John's fellow Carmelite, St. Teresa of Avila.

Both of these little books come as the fruits of a life-time of work on the writings of these two figures and their school; for Allison Peers' translations of the works of John of the Cross and of Teresa of Avila are now the standard editions in English, and his earlier three volumes of studies of the Spanish Mystics have been widely used.

In the course of the book Peers tells the unusual story of Teresa's life with its deep conversion coming when she was forty-two years old, and of her amazing apostolate, beginning ten years later, which took her all over sixteenth-century Spain founding convents of her reformed Carmelite order. Peers is bent on emphasizing to twentieth-century readers the practicality of this most beloved of the Spanish mystics. In narrating Teresa's life he accents her skill in winning over her enemies, her capacity to wear out opposition, her competence in the kitchen ("The Lord walks among the pots and pans"), her sheer physical endurance during the continual rough journeyings of her apostolate, and with it all her affability and humor. He has not omitted the remark attributed to Teresa when after nearly losing her life by drowning while crossing a treacherous ford en route to Burgos, the Lord spoke to Teresa mildly and told her, "But that is how I treat my friends," to which Teresa replied, "Yes, Lord, and that is why Thou hast so few of them."

In summing up her sainthood Peers keeps to the same note:

With St. Teresa . . . the fact that but for divine Grace, she might have become so much like what we are makes us feel that, with the aid of Divine Grace, we might become not unlike her. . . . She was just like ourselves — only so much better! Her sanctity was never frightening; it always beckoned to itself" (p. 23).

This terse, compact little volume, in addition to giving an objective frame of the events of this saint's life and of some of the principal influences that shaped her, goes on to the circumstances under which each of her books were written and to give a brief account of their contents. With this in hand a reader can more readily go to the highly readable contents of Teresa's four principal works: the *Life*; *Foundations*; *Way of Perfection*, and *Interior Castle*, and learn directly what a fascinating treasure-house of spiritual vitality, insight, and shrewd personal counsel is to be found there.

Peers, with much reason, is inclined to discount the *Life* and the *Foundations* as less significant than the *Way of Perfection* which he judges to be her elementary masterpiece and the *Interior Castle* which is regarded as her most mature spiritual classic. Of the *Way of Perfection* he says, "It contains the Saint's most practical pages — which is saying a good deal, for the more one reads her, the more keenly one feels that her mission in life was less to found Carmelite convents than to help millions every-

where to live the life of prayer" (p. 82). Of the sixth mansion of the *Interior Castle* Peers writes:

For not only does she soar high in them, and yet write with a sureness of touch which could only be the result of genuine experience, but at the same time she remains her ever-practical self and keeps in mind those who habitually live on a low level while striving after a higher. No better illustration than these chapters can be found of the descriptions of the Castilian as one with feet firmly planted on the soil yet with gaze fixed on Heaven (pp. 156-7).

There is something ugly about criticising an author for the lack of something he never intended to include in his book. But in this study of Teresa as in the previous one of John of the Cross, the book is laid aside with a feeling of its immense competence, its scholarly accuracy, and its usefulness as an objective outline, but with a certain hollow sense that Peers has either not possessed or else has resolutely refused to use an inward, subjective power of spiritual interpretation which would make his figures live and possess a certain luminous kindling grace. What Chambers has done in his life of *Sir Thomas More* or Sabatier in his *Francis of Assisi* or what Evelyn Underhill and Rufus Jones have accomplished for a variety of saints and mystics, may in part illustrate what is meant. In his vast contemporary passion to make Teresa so practical and so like ourselves, Peers has somehow failed inwardly to capture and to communicate what it was that made Teresa a saint. But he has given us an admirable launching platform from which to read Teresa for ourselves and by his excellent translations he has made her able to tell her own secret. Perhaps in the end this is the greatest service. His promise of a translation of two volumes of her *Letters* in the near future will put us still more in his debt.

DOUGLAS V. STEERE

CAN THE WORLD HOLD TOGETHER?

WORLD ORDER: ITS INTELLECTUAL AND CULTURAL FOUNDATION, *edited by* F. ERNEST JOHNSON. *Harper & Brothers*, \$2.00.

IF there is to be a creative organization of world society, there must be a common foundation of shared values, interests and activities which can serve to uphold the structure of international institutions. World organization, to grow or to endure, must rest upon a vital sense of world community. It is this fundamental issue, which has been central in the churches' work for world order, which poses the underlying problem dealt with in this symposium.

This volume is one of the series published by the Institute for Religious and Social Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary. It illustrates the

difficulties of achieving such a community better than it points to any solution of the difficulties. Even though the framework for the papers is provided by the Judeo-Christian and democratic traditions, there is such a variety of premises, so little evidence of an adequate common foundation of social principles, that in reading the book, the reader is compelled to see something of the much more turbulent conflict in values which wars with community on a world scale. The efforts of the editor to give as much unity and system as possible to the collection, by means of arrangement and titles, cannot overcome the disparate character of the papers here placed together.

This comment does not reflect upon the merit of individual chapters. Dr. Brightman argues for a philosophy of world community which will envisage a "proper balance between economic regimentation and cultural freedom." Irwin Edman calls for a return to an understanding of the "wholeness" of man's nature. Margaret Mead of the Museum of Natural History stresses the need of respect for each culture. Harold Lasswell points out the psychological need to preach and practice the dignity of man and to encourage identification with mankind as a whole. Professor Sorokin argues for his "integralist," or rather "integralist-ideational," culture — a rational and religious society. Joseph Chamberlain shows that the voluntary development of international law rests upon the will of the national societies. Edwin G. Nourse of the Brookings Institution argues for American foreign economic policy based on long-range self-interest. James Marshall has an excellent paper on the meaning of education in a democracy. Dr. I. L. Kandel analyzes efforts at international education, preceding UNESCO. Ordway Tead discusses democratic administration cogently. Clarence Pickett presents the growing world crisis in relief as a step towards reconstruction. Norman Cousins stresses American participation in world organization.

Papers of particular interest and merit were prepared by John Bennett, Father La Farge, and Rabbi M. M. Kaplan on the world order objectives of their respective faiths. Dr. Louis Finkelstein contributes a fine opening chapter on the need for collaboration by scholars on the causes and cure of war, and Dr. Johnson has a thoughtful chapter on the relation of the churches to war. Individually, a number of these papers are excellent. Together, however, at least to this reviewer, they do not help very much to clarify the task of establishing firm foundations of world order.

This may well be hindsight. The chapters were first presented as lectures in 1943 and 1944, before the atomic bomb, the post-war tensions among the United Nations, and the growing economic crisis had showed so clearly the tremendous character of the obstacles to a just and stable world order. Looking backward, we note an air of unwarranted overoptimism

about this task. It is at least gratifying to note that the chapters by churchmen reflect a somewhat greater awareness of the profound nature of these obstacles, combined with undimmed faith in the opportunity for overcoming them.

R. M. FAGLEY

A MISSION STUDY BOOK OF A NEW SPECIES

PORTRAIT OF A PILGRIM, by BUELL G. GALLAGHER. *Friendship Press*. \$1.00.

ONCE taken in hand, this readable little volume, with its fly-leaf quotation from John Bunyan, is likely to be read at a sitting. Neither Charles M. Sheldon nor Edward A. Steiner was a better story-teller than is Buell G. Gallagher, in his own modern idiom.

His book is a fictional account of a minister who took Christianity seriously in race relations. Ostensibly a collation of newspaper articles, personal and professional correspondence, and the like, with one greatly condensed sermon and its four concluding quatrains, the author undertakes to provide only a slender thread of connective narrative, plus an occasional explanatory note more like confidential information to the reader than critical apparatus. The effect is swift, terse and lively dialogue, heightened by a diversity of vocabulary ranging from authentic high-school slang, used by the preacher-hero's son, to the erudite lingo of a real student of social and theological issues. It constitutes a sort of personally conducted tour through the social provinces of America, revealing its recent rapid changes in human relations, the mechanism of economic adjustment and racial adaptation, and the ethical and spiritual meanings of life as now lived, particularly in our section of the planet.

High banter, penetrative insight, racy tempo, encyclopedic knowledge delightfully camouflaged, make this an almost painless introduction to Christian ethics and the sharp contrasts of American regionalism. The touch is deft, the treatment facile. As he studies this portrait of a pilgrim searching for the Christian way, the reader, brought face to face with the complex phases of American race relationships, finds out that he himself is the beneficiary (or the victim) of our own particular type of caste system.

Not an ordinary missionary book is this — about remote and strange peoples — but timely, vivid journalese about social tensions right where we live, challenging our uneasy consciences; competent sociology; keen religious insight. From cover to cover it bids us march "breast forward." Good reading for youth, church women, Christian laymen; good for a gift, good for study. The hero is Rev. "Tee Dee" O'Hara. May his tribe increase!

ROSS W. SANDERSON

ACCORDING TO JOHN

THE SPIRITUAL GOSPEL, by W. A. SMART. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press*. \$1.00.

DURING the war, all of the popular modern treatments of the Gospel of John went out of print. This little volume is therefore doubly welcome in supplying a temporary vacuum in our literature. It provides a readable introduction to the liberal point of view of the more recent past. It cannot be said, however, that it takes into consideration as much as might be hoped the current trends of our own day.

Doctor Smart is content to leave the author of "John" anonymous without leading his readers into a maze of fruitless hypotheses. He is wisely tentative about its location; he gives a discriminatingly balanced view of the polemical objectives of the Gospel; in regard to the sources he is content with restrained generalities. Though the speeches are cited as evidence of Greek style, it should not be forgotten that Josephus could invent as many orations as any.

The title of the book marks the chief characteristic which Smart finds in this Gospel. He sets out from the fact that the original meaning of spiritual is allegorical. In John we find the allegorizing of history, not the writing of a mere allegory. This reader had the feeling that the thesis was overworked when applied to the re-adaptation of eschatology. Yet this chapter contains a compact and valuable summary of Johannine teaching.

It is in the Christology that the newer trends are most absent. The author draws upon the exploded Memrah background for logos but omits reference to the importance of Torology in speculative Judaism. The idea of revelation through "the one whom God has sent" falls behind recent expositions of mediation. But we are profoundly thankful to Doctor Smart for his clear statement of the fundamental contradiction in the whole logos idea. May it hasten the time when theologians take more cognizance of that fact!

In the chapter on "life" I found myself wishing that more of the clear distinctions in the old book by E. F. Scott had been reproduced. Personally, I doubt very much if "man made divine" sums up what the Fourth Gospel means by the reception of life, unless the word "divine" is used in a very reduced connotation. The historical sequence — Synoptics, Paul, John — provides a convenient simplification, but I fear that it is a misleading one. There was no one uniform pattern of development in the first century. May there not be some aspects of the gospel of John which are much more primitive than the last generation of scholars admitted?

I have purposeily cited points of query and dissent rather than attempting any summary of this highly condensed evaluation of the Fourth Gospel. But I would end on a note of genuine appreciation for the useful and

provocative little volume which Professor Smart has written. It will lead many readers deeper into the treasures of this gospel and help them to understand how much lies behind the simple story with which many Bible readers have been satisfied.

CLARENCE T. CRAIG

THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION IN MATERIALS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

INTRODUCING THE NEW TESTAMENT, by ARCHIBALD M. HUNTER. *The Westminster Press, \$1.00.*

DR. Archibald M. Hunter, professor of New Testament at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, has tried to present the New Testament "to the ordinary reader" as it appears in the light of modern scholarship. Clearly and concisely he sets forth the authorship, time, and message of most of the books of the New Testament. Significant scholarship is made use of in order to provide the setting and viewpoint of the varied writings in the New Testament.

Literature for the reading and study of laymen in the schools of the church has too long neglected the results of Biblical scholarship in connection with the necessary history of the periods and conditions out of which Biblical literature developed. Dr. Hunter skilfully indicates the probable sources of information made use of by the writers of the Gospels and of Acts while providing some insight into the Synoptic problem and the use of the source known as *Quelle*. Sufficient information is given about Paul to enable the reader to feel this vital personality spreading the news about Jesus and establishing churches while carrying on his pastoral duties through those letters which remain for us today precious sources of information about the earliest message to the new followers of Jesus. An outline is provided of the contents of each book discussed, together with significant quotations. A chapter is devoted to matter pertaining to language, text, and the canon, thus answering many questions frequently neglected in religious literature prepared for laymen. Pastors and educators should find much of the contents of this book useful for their own study as well as valuable aid in teaching.

As his central theme throughout the book, Dr. Hunter stresses the self-revelation of God on the stage of human history. He considers that the New Testament study is chiefly concerned with the redemption of sinners, "perplexed and bewildered by the burden and mystery of life." In the sacrificial death on the cross "a barrier between God and man has been done away and a new way of access to God has been opened up for sinful men."

Like many who are following in the steps of Barth, Dr. Hunter seems to show a neglect of the specific, practical affairs of life and an overconfidence in stating or assenting to theological propositions. Perhaps this is a reason for the neglect of church attendance in Europe and in England. The stress on the abstract with respect to sin, and the neglect of the emphasis on love that pervades the New Testament, reflect a bias that is not always inspiring or constructive in the religious life of men today. Finding the will and purposes of God, working these out as children of a Father God in everyday life seem in this volume to be minor considerations. Yet Jesus is reported to have stressed the high importance of man's love for God and his love for his fellow men. Paul at his best made large room for the self-forgetting process of love. Legalistic religion gave way at times in his letter to Philemon and his thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. In Galatians we read "the entire law is summed up in one word, in you must love your neighbor as yourself." James (2:14, 17) says, "What is the use, my brethren, if a man says he has faith, and has nothing to show for it? Can faith save him? . . . So even faith unless it shows itself in deeds, is the nature of things dead."

Laymen in an "atomic age" need more than ever to find the significance of a life devoted more completely to the will and purposes of God and to discover the relation of the moral teachings in the New Testament to such a life. Dr. Hunter implies that one does not study the New Testament particularly as a guidebook to the good life, and consequently he gives less attention to such matters. Too little consideration is given to the way different New Testament books faced varying Christological views arising among early Christians. Laymen need to be brought even closer to the thinking of the Jewish as well as the Gentile world so as to evaluate emphases on miracle, changing views about the return of Jesus, and numerous other questions. Nevertheless, this is a most valuable and useful little book and should be widely read.

EDNA M. BAXTER

THOROUGH AND VERSATILE NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER, by E. G. SELWYN. *The Macmillan Co.*, \$6.00.

AMERICAN ministers and scholars have long neglected the First Epistle of Peter. The hundred verses of this letter contain, on a microcosmic scale, the whole range of New Testament experience. Here are fused both *kerygma* and *didachê*, both liturgy and social code, both communal tradition and personal communication. Here the total perspective which controlled the thought of the early church is focussed upon a single

occasion in its history. The interpreter of such a letter is therefore inhibited from hasty homiletical dabbling; he must essay a full-orbed interpretation of the history and theology of the apostolic age, with First Peter serving as the telescope through which to view the panorama. This is what Dr. Selwyn has done, — ample reason for us to welcome his comprehensive and erudite volume. His study is so replete with substance that a brief review can do little more than sketch in the outlines.

The first fourth of the volume is devoted to introduction — literary and theological. Dr. Selwyn energetically defends an early dating of the Epistle (62–64 A.D.), its integrity, and the close collaboration of Peter and Silvanus in its production. Their two minds, he believes, were in complete accord. Behind them lay multiform corporate traditions and vivid personal memories. Peter selected the traditional materials, permeating them with his personal reminiscences; Silvanus drafted the letter, as he had drafted the Thessalonian correspondence, and furnished its literary unity and Greek idiom. These conclusions, though ably supported, are far from convincing. They underestimate the evidence that points toward a later date and pseudonymity. The whole chronological framework of Dr. Selwyn's study suffers from his reliance upon the historical accuracy of the Gospels and of the Book of Acts.

The theological introduction, however, is not seriously undermined by these dubious literary conclusions because the significance of I Peter itself does not depend primarily upon theories of authorship and date. And in assessing the Christian witness of the Epistle, Dr. Selwyn is at his best. The fifty pages of Chapter IV constitute one of the best summaries of apostolic faith available in English. In these pages one finds a rare blend of historical accuracy, theological profundity and literary beauty.

The second quarter of the volume constitutes a verse-by-verse commentary on the Greek text. The thoroughness of treatment may be suggested by the fact that for every *line and a half* of Greek text, there is, on the average, a *page* of comment, in small type. Each verse is made the intersection of many roads, and Dr. Selwyn provides the signposts as they are needed. These cross-references average more than twenty to a page, and lead to innumerable writings: the Scriptures themselves, non-biblical Jewish and Christian writings, the Greek classics, the Church Fathers, and modern authors. As an aid to scholars, this commentary merits a place in the honored lineage of Westcott and Lightfoot.

The last half of the volume is filled with additional notes and supplementary essays. Here may be found the author's most original contribution, and one of genuine importance. The longest essay is a detailed application of *Formgeschichte* to the liturgical and catechetical materials found in the New Testament epistles. The existence of common patterns is

demonstrated, and the verbal interconnections are diagrammed with great care, in the mode of Seeburg and Carrington rather than of Dibelius. Other extended notes also merit superlative ranking: those dealing with the visit of Christ to the "spirits in prison"; the origin of the Trinitarian formula; the character of the earliest hymns; the work of prophets in the ecclesia; the paradox of joy in suffering. These topics indicate the complexity and richness of the studies.

Finally a word of appreciation for the excellence of typography, and for an imaginative style, of which the following is a sample: "The ceiling which divides the heavenly world from this is a thin one, and not distant. Hope already penetrates it from this side, and grace from the other; its removal will be the moment of the Lord's appearing" (p. 113).

PAUL S. MINEAR

THE CONTEMPORARY MEANING OF THE DECALOGUE

FOUNDATIONS FOR RECONSTRUCTION, by ELTON TRUEBLOOD. *Harper & Brothers*, \$1.00.

THIS volume may well be considered a sequel to *The Predicament of Modern Man* which many found so rewarding last year. In the former volume Professor Trueblood stated the problem of man in Western society today as being like that of a plant whose moral and spiritual roots have been severed. The phrase "cut-flower civilization" was unforgettable.

In *Foundations for Reconstruction* the author now undertakes to specify the particular roots that somehow must be re-attached or regrown if our Western democratic culture is to survive. These roots he says are the convictions about man and his duties that are enshrined in the Ten Commandments. The book is, accordingly, an exposition of the Ten Commandments in their positive significance for our day.

But this is no conventional discussion. The treatment of the theme is always suggestive and sometimes exciting. The author writes with an awareness of the internal stresses in our culture that are far deeper than those induced recently by the invention of the atom bomb.

Terrible [he says] as it may be to contemplate it the truth is that our system might change by adopting, more and more, our own local brand of fascism, without once employing that ugly word. We might do this by such degrees that we should never be conscious . . . of an ideological alteration in our pattern. Many of our ties to our spiritual heritage are now so weak that we might break them without knowing that we had done so.

Occasionally the connection between the early meanings of the Ten Commandments and their present application seems strained, as when the

words "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord, Thy God, in vain" are made the sanction for the recovery of urgency in the proclamation of our faith. But even here the attempt of some Christians to shore up our collapsing civilization by invoking a mood of "mild religiosity" does seem a way of taking the name of God in vain.

A particularly valuable part of the book to the present reader is that dealing with the first four, often called the religious, as distinguished from the last six, the ethical commandments. Here are unequivocal affirmations of the belief in God as the ultimate foundation of a vital morality; of the danger of an "easy, tolerant liberalism"; of the need for a gospel with as much vigor as our fathers' gospel of salvation and damnation; of the essential function of institutional religion in the rebuilding of civilization.

But the position of the author is not only opposed to that of the humanists who want an ethic without a superhuman sanction. It is also opposed to that of the ethical relativists, whose code represents merely an adjustment to specific psycho-social conditions. The principles he advocates have had the assent, he believes, of many generations, and without them "a good society cannot be constituted or reconstituted."

On the question of the existence of a universal natural moral law which the reason of man may discern, Professor Trueblood is closer to those who emphasize the notion (Cicero, Aquinas, Hooker, etc.) than to those who oppose it. Continental Christians under Barth's influence are likely to tell us that man's nature has been so corrupted by sin that he is unable to perceive, let alone practice, such a law. From this point of view all that Christians may hope to do in working with non-Christians is to co-operate with them for the achievement of specific ends as occasion affords. No possibility exists for the reconstruction of the moral foundations of society apart from the widespread conversion of men to Christ, as these Christians conceive him.

At the opposite pole from this view is that of Gilbert Murray who says:

The ordinary rules of morality, and even of honour, are rules tested by many thousand years of experience. They are the ways of action that man has found to be good, and knows to be good wherever he sees them. Not all people or all societies agree, of course, but the differences are superficial. Except in times of war or violent frenzy, a good man is a good man and a rogue a rogue all the world over.

In spite of the fact that he is a humanist, I believe that Gilbert Murray will like Professor Trueblood's volume better than the Barthians will.

I do not know any book, pertinent to present needs, that a clergyman might recommend with greater assurance to laymen.

JUSTIN WROE NIXON

HOW TO WITHSTAND SPIRITUAL DECLINE

MAN ON A ROCK, by RICHARD HERTZ. *University of North Carolina Press.*
\$3.00.

THIS work of Dr. Richard Hertz, professor of social science at the University of Dubuque, is occasionally marred by a too picturesque verbosity which impairs its readability; by an overdose of quotations (though they are excellently chosen); and by what appears to be too great reluctance to admit the inseparable common spiritual destiny of America and Europe, common — for better or worse. Yet, in spite of these and other minor weaknesses the book is truly brilliant and of particular interest also for the ecumenical Christian.

The main thesis is that modern man has been following after rational values and that life requires deeper foundations than this. Some of the major lines of thought appear in the following:

The [human] desire . . . turned toward material profits, which, because they were material, were exclusive — while spiritual profits are not. . . . The quality of a satisfying spiritual experience for everybody was lacking (p. 41). . . . The future depends on the combination of the machine, which so far is used for dynamic expansion, and a static society, which should use the machine for spiritual experiences (p. 160). . . . The only means to turn defeat . . . into victory, is to accept "lessening of man" . . . the acknowledgment that a super-human inspiration is the A and O (p. 166).

The chapters decribing "birth and death of the spirit" and "utopias without spirit," among which the philosophies of Veblen, Lenin and Keynes are reckoned, are especially worth pondering. Commendable also is the emphasis correctly placed on the extent of the modern crisis as reaching far towards East and West, far beyond the German realm. These deep-searching, analytical chapters alone establish the high worth of the publication.

Unfortunately the book, like others of its kind, stresses too overwhelmingly the spiritual angle of our crisis. In this, as developments since it was written have proven, danger is involved, as in every overemphasis. To be sure, the disaster of Europe is to a large extent caused by spiritual decline. But the false and dangerous conclusion is frequently being drawn that a new spiritual organism (as distinct from organization) might emerge and gain more than passing strength almost without any direct or indirect support forthcoming from the political and economic climate and environment. This, however, constitutes speculation on the impossible. Spiritual efforts, potentially of broad and basic impact, could under such circumstances not bear the expected fruits, but would be doomed to remain within the

utopian or aesthetic sphere. In our unfortunate times the need for simultaneity of constructive action within the different societal spheres cannot be emphasized too strongly.

Again and again Professor Hertz warns against spiritual decline: "The bourgeoisie had nothing to captivate the imagination" (p. 41) . . . "The value-blindness of the modern world produced hollow men" (p. 118) . . . "(Only) the totalitarian realities provided powerful myths" (p. 158). All this is in line also with Christian understanding of our situation. The remedy, which — as above noted — the author advises, is likewise in its core deeply religious, though neither theological nor denominational nor, in the strict meaning, Christian. It is offered with rare erudition and power of conviction. Consequently Christians who would be inclined to find it wanting in comparison with the completer truth and task of the ecumenical idea, could greatly profit from studying this impressive and essentially hopeful document.

ERNST W. MEYER

THE PARTNERSHIP OF RELIGION AND PSYCHIATRY

PEACE OF MIND, by JOSHUA LOTH LIEBMAN. *Simon & Schuster, \$2.50.*

RABBI Liebman's book, first presented as lectures at the Jewish Institute of Religion, speaks to people who are striving to liberate themselves from ideas and emotions which prevent inner tranquillity and fullness of life, which the author regards as the essential marks of sanity and maturity. He finds the main support for his views in the data of psychoanalysis which, he contends, holds the key to the achievement of integrated personality. The book also pleads for a partnership of religion and psychoanalysis.

It is difficult to say whether the author's *primary* interest is ethical, psychological, or theological. Was the book intended to set forth the moral affirmations and attitudes necessary for inner serenity and wholesome life? Or was he concerned to affirm the position of the psychoanalyst that neuroses may largely be traced to childhood experiences? Or was his major aim to prove the compatibility of the Freudian type of psychological studies with the distinctive orientation and philosophy of religion? All of these objectives are evident in the book but are mingled in such fashion that it is impossible to list them in order of importance. According to the announcement on the jacket, Rabbi Liebman's book constitutes a marriage of religion and psychoanalysis. The author senses a certain distinctiveness in each of the two interests and disciplines, but actually avoids the issue whether a nonmoral and a moral appraisal of life and philosophies can be welded together into a unity. He writes:

It must be understood that psychology and psychotherapy are scientific disciplines not basically concerned with moral judgments, whereas religion inevitably lives in the realm of ethical concepts. Psychotherapy is committed to utter neutrality in moral affairs and goes beyond its province when it makes "value judgments" about the total meanings of life. Religion, on the other hand, fails in its spiritual duty when it does not give men and women a perspective about their place in God's plan (pp. 180-1).

But the author goes on to say:

The discoveries of the psychiatrist's clinic in the field of interpersonal relationships should inspire religion to stress new principles of human action, to sanction new approaches to the self, to society and to the universe. . . . Religion can gain some valuable aid from the best psychological clinics of our time and can use its influence with human beings to teach millions of normal men and women fundamental new truths about their psychic and moral needs and duties (pp. 182-3).

In much of the discussion this reviewer finds a good deal of uncritical rhapsody, a tendency to panegyric suggesting a convert to a new-found faith. Perhaps carried away by his extraordinary command of language and his lively and rich imagination, Rabbi Liebman goes far beyond the agreements of psychoanalysts themselves as to the potency of ideational and emotional factors in sickness or health. For instance, he attributes ulcers to fear and anxieties. A noted physiologist, Dr. A. C. Ivy of Northwestern University, maintains that while emotional factors such as sustained anxiety seem to have some relation to peptic ulcers, there is no warrant for asserting that emotional disturbance is the cause of the disease. His conclusions are based on clinical studies.

As to his more basic viewpoint, Dr. Liebman attributes adult fears and anxieties mainly to the carrying over of a sense of insecurity from infancy and seems to imply that the removal of these tensions would constitute normality. But does he not claim too much in assuming that peace of mind itself is unadulterated good and the sole mark of sanity and maturity? Dr. Karl M. Bowman, professor of psychiatry in the University of California has recently counselled parents not to foster in the minds of their children an exaggerated sense of security since the world in which they live is highly insecure: "We should aim to develop personalities capable of dealing with all situations and able to bear stress and strain, rather than to create a social organization which relieves individuals of all necessity for strength of character and feeling of responsibility."

While then Rabbi Liebman makes a good case in asserting that psychotherapy and the ministrations of religion may and do parallel each other, he fails to show that they can converge in a common outlook and philos-

ophy. Far from being antagonistic, however, religion and psychiatry are mutually supplementary. Each is capable of supporting man at points where the other is weakest or has failed. There is no danger that psychiatry will displace religion, nor is it any longer possible for religion to sweep back the rising tide of psychologic knowledge that is floating man off the submerged ledges of grief and perplexity. Harried mankind needs both religion and psychiatry. Men should no longer deny themselves the assistance to be derived either from the revealed word of God or the findings of "revealed psychology."

It is a significant commentary on the mood of the generation that Rabbi Liebman's book has caught on and become a best seller.

BERNARD HELLER

IRENIC BUT UNCOMPROMISING SUPERNATURALISM

CHRISTIANITY RIGHTLY SO CALLED, by SAMUEL G. CRAIG. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., \$2.00.

THROUGH the centuries men have tried to define in concrete form what is connoted by the abstract term Christianity. They have differed widely in their definitions but most, if not all, of them professed to be loyal to Jesus Christ.

Since the turn of the present century numerous books and pamphlets have been written on *What is Christianity* — and the end is not yet. Two books created world-wide interest, assent and dissent: Adolf von Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums*; and, about eighteen years later, Karl Barth's *Der Römer Brief*, which in substance, though not in name, was a new form, or a rediscovery of an old form, of Christianity. These two books are irreconcilable; the first was the beginning of the end of a theological era; the second, the beginning of a new theological era. Both authors were not only outstanding scholars but each in his own way extolled Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. In this country more recently William Adams Brown published *The Essence of Christianity* and *The Outlines of Christian Theology*. Within a few years H. T. Rall has been awarded the Bross Prize for his book on the same subject. The editor of the "Christian Century," Dr. Morrison, chose the same subject for a Yale course of lectures.

None of the books above mentioned was written from the same point of view as Craig's *Christianity Rightly So Called*. In the Foreword the author acknowledges his indebtedness to the late Benjamin B. Warfield, one-time professor of systematic theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary. The space allowed the reviewer permits only brief comments on the book. It is not only a book that should have been written and published but it ought also to be read and pondered by professors, stu-

dents, ministers, and laymen. The style is clear as crystal. While the author, as the title of the book implies, differs from many of his predecessors and his contemporaries, he clearly states the reason for the views he holds. Chapter III, "The Essential Content of Christianity," the author suggests should be read first: "The core of the book will be found in that chapter." Those who, either by personal acquaintance or by hearsay, may know the academic background of the writer, will be not a little surprised and gratified by his irenic spirit. He affirms the importance of polemics but allows wide space for all those who have *Christianity rightly so called*. He is neither a rock-ribbed fundamentalist nor an all-inclusive modernist. He is, however, an uncompromising supernaturalist and bases his convictions on the Bible and the ancient creeds. Among those who are "Christians rightly so called" he includes "Greek and Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Methodists, etc., providing they not only accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour but also bear consistent witness that the ecumenical creeds and the evangelical confessions of the Reformation are thoroughly supernaturalistic."

On the other hand he is an inveterate opponent to all forms of humanistic idealism, evolutionism, naturalism, Unitarianism, Mysticism written with a capital *M* and Rationalism with a capital *R*. He concedes that there are mystic and reasonable elements in what he regards as Supernatural Christianity. But he would not yield an inch to Unitarians, Christian Scientists, or naturalists of any sort. With those who regard the Scriptures as the self-revelation of God in history, consummated in Jesus Christ crucified, risen, glorified, he would be disposed to be irenic far more than polemic.

Again and again he repeats the statement, which one may imagine to be his test of "Christianity rightly so called": In the Bible are the *facts* wrought by God, the *doctrines* explaining the facts, and the *quality of life* which the doctrines require, the life growing out of doctrine as the branch from the vine.

The author's conception of miracles indicates his irenic spirit. He writes:

It is of course true that all the miracles recorded in the Scriptures are not essential to the same degree. Conceivably many of them might never have happened. . . . No one supposes, for instance, that Christianity stands or falls with the question whether an axe floated in the days of Elisha or whether Jonah was swallowed by the whale or whether Jesus fed five thousand with five loaves and two fishes.

These and many other miracles are not essential facts in Christianity. The author needs not be told that such concessions were the first step toward the naturalism and modernism of our time. He saves himself, however, from going further down the road by the sentence which follows:

"But while that is true there are *other miracles* recorded in the Scriptures which are essential to the very existence of Christianity . . . We refer to miracles such as the incarnation and the resurrection of Christ from the dead." These "enter into the substance of the Christian religion." He adds what the majority of those who call themselves Christians believe, that "Jesus Christ himself is the greatest of all miracles."

The so-called miracles did not cease with the resurrection but continue through all climes and times in the form of "regeneration, and sanctification by means of which sinners are restored to newness of life and the tendencies of evil within them are progressively eradicated and holy dispositions are implanted, nourished, and perfected." In the last chapter (p. 262), is found a sentence, which ought to be expanded into a chapter, in substance as follows: Christianity has not only brought peace and comfort and inspiration to individuals but has changed and is changing social, economic, and political conditions. Yet its purpose and scope are more than a social and economic order; it is the kingdom of God, which is far greater than any social order now in existence and which, when realized, will include the best in God for man in every social order.

A contrast is drawn between the "Evangelicalism of Protestantism and the Sacerdotalism of Greek and Roman Catholicism." While the author prefers evangelical Protestantism, he recognizes its "deformations," and he does not condemn Greek and Roman Catholicism as "falsifications" of Christianity, representing Christianity *falsely* so called. It is to be regretted that the book is without an index.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS

AN UTTERLY LOVELY BOOK

THE IDEA OF CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS OR GOD IN MAN. A Critical Essay, by GEORGE SANTAYANA. *Charles Scribner's Sons*, \$2.75.

THE authorship of this book is even more significant than its content. Given Santayana's published works over past years this latest work seems unpredictable, if not improbable. Yet the publishers say of it that it is possibly the most important he has written.

It has been a matter of common knowledge that Santayana's background was Roman Catholic. He was never a formally "practising" Catholic during his years here. But he had little sympathy with Protestantism in general, and no sympathy with the residual New England Puritanism which he found around him in Boston and Cambridge. He seemed, ecclesiastically, a man without a country. For, if he failed to find a lodging place in conventional Catholicism or traditional Protestantism, he had even less interest in that Catholic Modernism of the early years of this century, which proposed

to enable its advocates to make the best of the two worlds of Catholic dogma and modern science.

Meanwhile the book in hand is not something hastily "got up" at the end of a long life. It has not been assembled, it has matured over many years of quiet and secret reflection. One has learned to expect delicacy of perception and precision of statement from Santayana; the surprise of these pages is their simple piety, their mystical mood.

The passkey to the book is to be found in two or three sentences midway through its pages:

I am not attempting to reconstruct a life of Jesus. I am only studying the idea of Christ in the Gospels. And in that idea, lying beneath the legendary figure of Jesus on earth, there is undoubtedly a theological and mystical figure of Christ, the son of God, the eternal word of the Father. The value of the idea of Christ does not depend on its having been already realized in fact, but on the depth to which it sounds the ultimate vocation of every living being. . . . It is a poetic expression of the dawn of spirit in every reflective mind.

Santayana, therefore, does not abandon the "quest of the historical Jesus"; he merely thinks it futile and irrelevant to embark on that quest. He concedes, however, by implication the historicity of Jesus in his statement that Jesus was the occasion for the Gospel legends, rather than the hero of a Pauline myth.

The Gospels, as he reads them, are not biographies or works of history; they are the creations of Christian inspiration. We test them not by their fidelity to fact, but by their congruity with the faith. The inspiration which created them was not the insight of the individual authors; it was an expression of the faith of the whole Christian community. Historically, they may be in detail true or false; religiously they are wholly true. They were "composed in the Church, by the Church, for the Church."

The central, constant theme of the Gospels is the truth of God-in-man. Santayana does not hesitate to read back into the Gospels the full Nicene doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son and the Chalcedonian definition of the two natures in one person. Given these mature pronouncements his theology conforms in the main to the orthodox tradition.

A discriminating chapter discusses the characteristics of each of the four Gospels. Mark is the most perfect because of its greater dramatic truth; Luke is a more conventional work of art; Matthew gives us the *catechesis* current in the Church; John gives us the felt contrast between the two levels at which Christ lived his life, the divine and the human, the eternal and the temporal.

Further chapters discuss Prophecies and Precepts, the Prayers, the Parables, the Passion. The book then goes on to a consideration of the terms

Messiah, Son of God, Son of Man. A final section reviews this whole idea of God-in-man in the light of modern modes of thinking. Santayana concludes that it is for us the authentic and classical statement of all that is meant by mysticism.

Two or three of his emphases call for comment. He thinks that the God-idea in question was derived from prior Judaism; it is monarchical, autocratic, arbitrary. God's secrets are hid with him and he is responsible only to himself. There is an almost pre-Calvinist brief for the inscrutable sovereignty of God. Jesus, in his teaching, was therefore under bonds to vindicate this austerity, which seems at times ethically indefensible. Hence the strain of tragedy running through his life. He could not always square his "native heaven and his adopted earth."

Santayana's doctrine of the person of Christ seems at times to tremble on the verge of the heresy of two persons, to match the two natures. He uses the analogy of "a man leading a double life." The Gospels seem to him to suggest that there was in Christ "an alteration of phases and a compromise in status." Yet that is precisely the conception to which all true mysticism, to say nothing of formal orthodoxy, lays siege.

Schweitzer says that no one can write a life of the historical Jesus without telling much truth about himself. The same would seem to be true of this attempt to write of the idea of Christ in the Gospels. When we find references to the "slightly sarcastic sadness" of Jesus; when we are bidden find in the Sermon on the Mount a "disenchanted ascetic, unearthly insight"; when we are told that Jesus "*preferred* low company, for the sake of a bitter realization of his humanity"; that his reticence as to working miracles was due, "perhaps, to the sense of the futility of these small mercies" in the face of the total wretchedness of humanity — there we recognize the author rather than the subject.

This is, however, an utterly lovely book. Its spirit is brooding, humble, and wholly devout. Santayana himself has never fitted easily into any of our convenient pigeon holes. The fact that *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels* cannot be domesticated in, and then dismissed from, any of our more familiar types of Gospel criticism only makes it the more interesting and important.

WILLARD L. SPERRY

THE THREE IN ONE

THE TRINITY AND CHRISTIAN DEVOTION, by CHARLES W. LOWRY. *Harper & Bros.*, \$1.50.

PREVIEWING his theme, the author writes: "Of all Christian doctrines that of the Trinity is perhaps the most suspect. It connotes not only a mystery, but one that is unnecessary. It suggests a dull enigma, a riddle that is not even interesting" (p. 21). Against this adverse psychology he has per-

sisted in producing a book which he confesses will be "heavy going" for the uninitiated. His suggestion that the theological tyro shall read the book backward, however, does not seem at all realistic to this reviewer. It is a book of singular value and should be accepted, for better or for worse, for what it is: theologically profound, sophisticated, erudite, and subtle. Nothing can or should explain away these qualities.

The author's general viewpoint is suggested on page 19:

The doctrine of the Trinity is more scientific, it has in it more of a necessary general inference, it is less concrete, it is less a reflex of immediate experience, than anything in the Creeds or in the New Testament. Even so, it partakes of the preference of religion for symbol and analogy. It purports to give a picture of the God as revealed in Christ — of the God of whom first century Christians were to say without even an affectation of simplicity: "He is Love." Such a conception of God in Himself, like the Incarnation in the Nicene Creed, can only be presented effectively and truly in the form of a myth — a picture or a drama or a story. Such a mode of presentation has on it necessarily the earmarks of the finite. The infinite Being of God must be strictly inconceivable to us.

Now, a "necessary general inference" implies a rational process, whereas the truth of myth may well be suprarational. One of the author's major struggles throughout the book is to be just rationalistic enough and still to escape rationalism — rationalistic enough to understand the development of Trinitarian doctrine and to criticize it both from the standpoint of general philosophical position and from its own particular historic evolution. Chapter III asks, "Is the Christian Religion a Trinitarian Religion?" and clearly answers "Yes."

The none-too-direct course by which the author reaches this conclusion, in its many aspects and turnings, is too complicated for summary in the brief space available in a review. In the outcome of his thinking, Trinitarian doctrine rests upon special revelation validated by the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit. But this formulation of the case is too simple. By internal necessity a particular course of revelation had to be followed to completion. According to the faith of the Apostolic Church the Christian through the man Christ Jesus was related to the very God. And this, as the author rather daringly suggests (p. 67), theoretically might have eventuated in a Binitarian rather than a Trinitarian view of God, the Godhead being understood in terms of the relationship of Father and Son. This, the author remarks, would in some ways have lightened the intellectual task of Christian theologians. But the church was not left merely to generalize from its experience of God in Christ. Primitive Christianity was specifically a "pneumatic" phenomenon:

The doctrine of the Trinity did not come into existence as a flight of metaphysical fancy or as a result of a disposition to revel in interesting but inconse-

quential paradox. It came into existence as an integral *accompaniment* of certain unexpected events that shook, first, the souls of a few elect men, and then the world itself, to the foundations. I use the word "accompaniment" rather than "implication," for it seems to me that the essential doctrine of the Trinity — the view that the object of Christian faith and worship is Three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as well as in some ultimate sense One — was given with the events in which God was seen as speaking and acting for the salvation of the world and for the fulfillment of His purpose in creation. At least it was, as a reflective rational implication, very much fused with apprehension, faith, and the sense of being acted upon, in the crucible of a total experience.

The Church's thinking, in brief, was so directed by the Spirit as to originate the Trinitarian faith.

Chapter V, "What is the Doctrine of the Trinity?" is technically crucial. Generally speaking, what the author arrives at is a species of "social" Trinity. He rejects Sabellianism and modalism and instead offers the following: "The third alternative in thought about the Trinity is the admission of the analogy of personal society, intercourse, and fellowship. It is the view that God within the Unity of His Divine life experiences and comprehends communication, mutuality, love, and shared beatitude" (pp. 101-2). There is danger, the author recognizes, in such terms. Great care must be taken to safeguard the absolute unity of God. Any version of the Trinity inevitably presents difficulty for that type of thinking which follows Greek modes and looks for mathematical unity. If, however, one begins with God as love, mutuality and shared beatitude become ultimate marks of God.

We have to do at every point with the love of the blessed Trinity — love in action, love manifested to us — but love first of being, love that eternally is, and love in which there is a true participation and fellowship of three Divine persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (p. 107).

It is permissible, this reviewer thinks, to hold that this position faces us in the right direction, but is after all somewhat too precise in definition. The essential truth of myth is becoming frozen rather than being left fluid as it was in its creative beginnings.

Chapters V and VI pass on to the consequences of the Trinitarian viewpoint for Christian devotion, expressed as worship and as action. The author nowhere implies that the consequences which he traces can flow *only* from the holding of one of the Trinitarian views, for example, his own. The undeveloped or weak Trinitarianism, or the complete lack of Trinitarian doctrine, held by the authors of some of the Church's devotional classics, both of hymn and of prayer, should be a sufficient answer to any such argument. A book in which Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were directly and immediately worshipped and glorified would be likely to contain a good deal of such heterodox material. The devotion, then, which Dr. Lowry's book

voices, need not be the exclusive experience of those who hold his ideas. It is to American theological statement of a neglected doctrine rather than to devotional practices that he has made a really original and notable contribution.

HARLAN PAUL DOUGLASS

PROTESTANT TRIVIALITY AND CATHOLIC ATTACK

MEN AND MOVEMENTS IN THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH, by E. CLOWES CHORLEY. *Charles Scribner's Sons*, \$4.00.

MAJOR TRENDS IN AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY, by FRANCIS X. CURRAN, S.J. *The America Press*, \$2.50.

THE chronicle and the apology are standard types of ecclesiastical history. Chorley has taken pains to pile high a mountain of trivialities about the Episcopal Church. Curran shows skill in ramming his sociological bulldozer into the nationalism, class structure, and race prejudice of Protestantism. The chronicler ignores everything beyond his pale, and sees almost nothing within it except varying interpretations of rubrics, canons, and articles of faith. The apologist is so certain that his is the "one true Church" that he expects nothing in those lost to Rome except baseness and confusion. From the standpoint of this reviewer neither volume is worthy history. Indeed, the two volumes are excellent examples of kinds of writing that are not needed, if the Christian position is to be illustrated by great men within each sect and by genuine sympathy with those who happen to be outside.

Chorley's trivializing can be aptly illustrated by the contrast of sixteen indexed references to colored stoles with only two to the tenth of our population which has a colored skin. Curran knows the plight of the Negro, and catalogues the sins committed against him, but fails to suggest that Catholics may share the responsibility. Does his own Georgetown accept Negroes?

Chorley's somewhat patchy appliqué pattern is not without its threads of humor. Against his small background he suggests a future when there will be no more ecclesiastical parties, but all Episcopalians will be "at one and the same time *catholic, evangelical, liberal*." This glimmering sweetness and light would seem all but lost in the rain of current controversies. And is there nothing to be done about the sheep not of this excellent fold?

With Celtic pugnacity Curran denounces the division of Protestant sects according to the differences of race, language, and wealth. But he has done his cause no good in lauding the wholesale conversion of 200,000 aborigines by a monk with one assistant, and even the mass induction of 300,000 converts single-handed. This is what makes the Evangelical demand signs of regeneration in Christians.

Neither book is truly fair to the greatness within each body. Chorley might have answered the attack on non-Romans by making something of

Algernon Crapsey, the Christian Socialist; of William Norman Guthrie, the prince of imaginative liturgists; of Elwood Worcester, the apostle to the sick; of William Lawrence, bishop of his university and commonwealth as well as of his diocese. These are men of more moment in larger streams of church life than the party leaders in movements known as "low," "broad," "high," etc. It must be difficult indeed for an official historiographer to maneuver among party issues; but can the Episcopal Church afford to be represented by one too timid to mention the movement toward organic union with the Presbyterians?

Curran has hit Protestants where it hurts, in the paunchy midriff of complacency. But true Catholic humility is evidently more than he thinks his church can afford.

A churchman of Southern birth, now a banker on Wall Street, read these two books and was struck aghast. He took the Catholic account as a solemn warning against the policy of Klansmen, hooded and unhooded. Protestant prejudice and bigotry have not really whipped the underdog, but rather incited it to become the strongest and loudest hound in the pack of American sects. Protestants still stand to learn from Chorley's sympathy with men of the Anglican parties, and even to extend fellow-feeling to all sorts and conditions of men. And even the sects may aspire to become what Curran asserts his Church is — the Mother of Americans, whatever their color, language, or social state.

PAUL GRIMLEY KUNTZ

THE DAMNED VISIT HEAVEN

THE GREAT DIVORCE, by C. S. LEWIS. *The Macmillan Company*, \$1.50.

EVIL can be undone, but it cannot 'develop' into good," writes Lewis in his Preface to *The Great Divorce*. Mr. Lewis just does not believe that the perennial attempt to keep Heaven wedded to Hell is justified.

The argument of the book is that if we prefer Hell we cannot see Heaven, and will find that, for us, earth has just been a region in Hell. If we prefer Heaven, we cannot retain even the smell of Hell, and will discover that, for us, earth has been a part of Heaven from the beginning.

This relatively trite argument is set forth in the Lewis style made famous by the *Screwtape Letters*. The author finds himself journeying with the damned on a day's excursion to the borders of Heaven. The damned have been living in a vague, shadowy region, some of them new-comers there, others inhabitants there for centuries. There they have been able to secure whatever they desired by merely wishing for it; but their wishing, founded upon nothing more substantial than earthly experience, never finds a way to overcome those enemies of personality which we call fear, envy, distrust, and other forms of selfishness.

After reaching the borders of Heaven, very interesting dialogues ensue between the voyagers and certain beings who emerge from the distant mountains to encourage them to continue their journey. An excellent collection of recognizable personality types are produced. Thus George MacDonald appears as the guide for Mr. Lewis. "Hell is a state of mind," he declares. "Every state of mind, left to itself — every shutting up of the creature within the dungeon of its own mind — is, in the end, Hell."

For those who are seeking a key to their own actions this book may prove illuminating. For instance, one learns that the *passion* of pity is used as a weapon by bad people against good ones; it will die. The *action* of pity will live forever.

One is glad to note from the concluding sentence that Mr. Lewis woke up — still on earth — with time enough left to write us another book.

W. GLENN ROBERTS

A COLLEGIAN'S FIRST READER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

NEW TESTAMENT LIFE AND LITERATURE, by DONALD W. RIDDLE AND HAROLD H. HUTSON. *The University of Chicago Press*, \$3.00.

RIDDLE and Hutson have aimed at presenting the "results of scholarship" in the New Testament field in a "first reader" for college students. After four chapters of historical background which set the stage for the beginnings of the Christian movement, they turn to the career of Jesus, the rise of Christianity, the life and letters of Paul, the synoptic gospels as literature, and the collection of Paul's letters. Hebrews, Revelation, and I Peter are handled together under the heading "Christianity Confronts the State"; similarly the Fourth Gospel and James are joined and headed "The Mind and the Spirit." The rest of the New Testament is classified under "Maturing Christianity." The last chapter deals with canon, text, and translation of the New Testament. In an appendix the leading ideas in the New Testament are discussed. There is an excellent select bibliography.

The authors are expert in summarizing historical facts, and probably for this reason the first four chapters and the last are the most interesting and the most ably written. When they deal with the New Testament itself, however, their results are not so satisfactory. Too many theories are presented as if they were almost self-evident truths; and it must be said that the authors' faith in the "scientific" methods which they employ is hardly warranted.

Recent scholarship has perfected two techniques. . . . The first is the test of environment rigidly applied: those elements in the tradition which fail to

harmonize with the Jewish environment in which Jesus operated are to be labelled as secondary additions, constructed by the evangelists to adapt the message to gentile ears. The main problem involved in the use of this method is the identification of normative Judaism of the first century. The second technique requires the close examination of gospel materials to discover the *forms* which are more primitive in nature; these are to be separated from the secondary editorial and transitional material (pp. 67-68).

This sounds simple enough. But what do we really know of first-century Judaism that justifies this wholesale rejection of "secondary additions?" What became "normative Judaism" at the end of the second century was not necessarily what Jesus taught in "Galilee of the gentiles" nearly two centuries earlier. Moreover, it is not really possible to determine the age of a passage by examining its form, no matter how closely. For instance, Jesus apparently often spoke in parables; but how do we know that the evangelist Luke did not also enjoy inventing them? How many years must elapse before a simple matter-of-fact story becomes a miracle tale? Our authors are not sufficiently sceptical of their own methods, and the more critical critic must wonder how they can be so confident of their results.

What was the Christianity which expressed itself in New Testament life and literature? The authors never clearly define it, though several quotations may perhaps serve to show their approach. "What became Christianity was, in the beginning, the experience of those who declared that they had 'seen' Jesus subsequent to his death" (p. 111). "Christianity endured because it satisfied all the needs which the various religions satisfied only in part — and satisfied more needs" (p. 147). "If in becoming institutionalized it lost some of its earlier charm, it gained the eclectic beauty of a mighty, assimilative religious movement" (p. 178). What was it? Was it, as the authors sometimes seem to suggest, merely an expression of Bergson's *élan vital*?

The student of the New Testament will want to ask the authors several further questions. They say (p. 149), "The primary concern of all this literature is religious motivation and indoctrination." Why then do they not endeavor to understand the literature in terms of its own purpose? Why cannot they write a book which presents the New Testament and its life as meaningful to the college student of today? As literature the New Testament does not possess tremendous importance; but if in it we are confronted with what the authors once mention as "the fact of God in history" (p. 55), there is no more significant book. Is there a God? Does he work in history? What is Jesus' relation to him? What is the church? These questions need answers from the New Testament scholarship of today and tomorrow. Creativity and adaptability (p. 208) are not enough.

It is probable that such a work as E. Stauffer's *Theologie des Neuen*

Testaments (Geneva, 1945) lies too far from the ordinary experience of American college students to be used by them. But unless the college teacher is aware of the ultimate meaning of his subject, and unless he tries to understand and interpret New Testament thought as well as its life and literature, his teaching will not achieve the depth which college students, especially veterans, require.

ROBERT M. GRANT

SUBJECTIVE AND OBJECTIVE SOURCES OF RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

CALVINISM, by ARTHUR DAKIN. *The Westminster Press*, \$2.75.

PRESIDENT Arthur Dakin of the Baptist College of Bristol, England, and currently president of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, has written a very useful little book about Calvinism. Nearly half of it consists of a digest of the famous *Institutes*. The exposition is delightfully clear, the judgments thoughtful and judiciously expressed, and the interpretation relevant to the living issues of the present age. At the same time a head-on encounter with the *Institutes* is a somewhat trying experience, not always mitigated by Dr. Dakin's style, which is a bit pedestrian and not wholly calculated to vitalize the over-systematic aspects of Calvin's great work. Its colossal intellectual structure remains all too awe-inspiring and too little illumined by the commentator's imagination.

The second section of the book, entitled "Calvinism as an Ecclesiastical System," is much thinner, and chiefly concerned with the development of particular Calvinistic churches in Europe and the English-speaking world. The present reviewer would gladly have exchanged this section for an equally brief introduction telling about Calvin the man and his times. Such an introduction would have eased the reader into a study and understanding of the *Institutes* as the present structure of the book does not do.

The third part deals with "Aspects of Calvinism," including its view of the Scriptures, its way of life, and its outlook and impact upon the social order and the state. It reveals the author's own views and constitutes a moderate criticism of Calvin. The concluding section deals with the Barthian theology as, in some aspects, an offspring of Calvinism and a revival of its influence in the world.

The present reviewer finds the crucial point of Dr. Dakin's interpretation in the incompletely resolved issue between the Scriptures and the Testimony of the Spirit as the principle of authority in religion (pp. 179 ff). Unquestionably the tension between the external and the internal aspects of authority is not one which is "settled." Did Calvin simply substitute the Bible for the Pope, or did he erect a subjective authority assumed to be the

immediate voice of the Spirit but in effect uttering the varying movements of individual minds and ultimately leading to the "right of private judgment"? Calvinism, as the author views it, was not indubitably on one side rather than the other. The issues between external and internal authority constitute the ambiguous watershed of the Calvinistic system from which streams actually flow in both directions.

By setting forth the witness of the Spirit in subordination to the doctrine of election ("only the elect can make anything of it"), Calvinism, in spite of its mighty contributions to democracy, turns out in the main (in contrast with the sects) to be socially and politically conservative, and oriented toward capitalism and the rights of private property. At the same time contrary influences are equally original and authentic in the system. The paradox goes back to Calvin himself and to the long ancient course of Christian history.

HARLAN PAUL DOUGLASS

A DELIGHTFUL BOOK OF BIBLICAL LORE

OUR ROVING BIBLE, by LAWRENCE E. NELSON. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press*, \$2.75.

THIS is an utterly delightful book, full of unfamiliar Biblical lore and charming wit. Mr. Nelson follows the English Bible as it makes itself at home in the English-speaking world and as the world itself takes the book to its heart. Devoting chapters to the successive great ages of our life, he reveals how the Bible influenced not only the thinking of the period but also how it entered the common life to change its language, to give it new words and to shape its customs and its ideals. From the time when Augustine entered England to convert its people to the Christian faith to our own day, the author shows how each generation used the Bible and had its life affected by both its religion and its language.

The book contains a great deal of random information and true learning, of sharp wit and trivial humor. It would be an impossible task for a reviewer to compass this meandering journey, each turn of which reveals a new vista where the author points out scenes which otherwise have been passed unobserved. In each chapter he takes pains to point out scenes of linguistic interest. In the Middle English period, for instance, such French words as "cell," "chaplain," "passion," "paradise," "sacrament" and "saint" came into our language. "Parlor," for example, once meant the room where monks were permitted to talk. Or, in the struggles of the English Revolution, Milton coined words like "prelatory," "goosery," and "fustianist." "Sectarian," "cant" and "fanatic" (whence baseball "fan") all come from the theological invective of the period.

Typical of the book is the section which deals with Henry the Eighth's

period. Most of us do not know that the Mother Goose rhymes all hid sharp political jibes. When Cardinal Wolsey tried to buy up the lampoons written against him, the people began to sing,

Little Boy Blue, come blow your horn,
The sheep's in the meadow, the cow's in the corn,

reminding the "Boy Bachelor" of his humble origin as son of an Ipswich butcher and cattle grazer, suggesting that he wake up to what was going on about him instead of remaining wrapped in his pleasant dreams of power.

Jack and Jill
Went up the hill
To fetch a pail of water

taunted Wolsey and Bishop Tarbes for going to France to try for a marriage between Mary Tudor and the French king, and with intriguing for the holy water of the popeship which the cardinal so eagerly desired.

Or, to dip into another chapter, the author traces the effect of the Bible on Cowper, on the mad William Blake, who wrote

Both read the Bible day and night,
But thou read'st black where I read white,

or on the "literary cormorant," Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

Shelley's wife in her diary reveals how the poet reads the Bible each day; Burns could write, "Still I am a very sincere believer in the Bible; but I am drawn by the conviction of a man, not the halter of an ass"; and Byron's estranged wife could complain of his "gloomiest Calvinistic tenets."

This review, I am afraid, gives an altogether false impression of the book since I have chosen odd bits at random from its crowded pages. True, the author has collected a fantastic variety of material. But all of it is relevant to his theme and all of it when added up, reveals how deeply the Bible has penetrated into our life and literature. It is the kind of book a man picks up to read a chapter here and there. It has been my bed-side reading now for several weeks, not because it stimulates my devotion but because it excites my interest and awakens my gratitude and wonder. Never irreverent, but always charming, it will be a cherished comrade for all those who love the Bible both for its religion and its literature.

JOHN C. SCHROEDER

OTHER REVIEWS

REMBRANDT, THE JEWS, AND THE BIBLE, by FRANZ LANDSBERGER. *Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, \$3.00.*

THE author was for many years professor of art at the University of Breslau and is now on the faculty of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. His highly competent exposition and illustration of this aspect

of Rembrandt's many-sided career are obviously intended to commend Jewish cultural values in an unfriendly world which in large areas has recently denied and violently repudiated them. His historical chapters show the favorable status of the Jewish communities in Holland in the seventeenth century. There were influential and cultivated Jews whom Rembrandt appreciated and among whom he lived. He was fond of depicting their opulence and benignity, but also found repeated subjects among the humbler types. Back of the Jews was their Bible, and Rembrandt was insatiably addicted to Biblical themes, on which he lavished a great part of his genius. Both the secular and religious phases of his art as oriented toward the Jews are presented in sixty-six plates — some of which seem to show evidence of previous use. Apart from its careful historical and highly authoritative artistic material, the book constitutes a genuinely relevant document with respect to the relations of races and classes in the modern world.

BEST SERMONS, 1946, *edited by G. PAUL BUTLER. Harper & Bros., \$2.75.*

THE 1946 edition of this anthology is the third in the series. It consists of fifty-two sermons representing eighteen denominations, seventeen states, and five nations — a selection out of 5,674 sermons submitted. Representatives of 252 denominations were said to have been invited to participate, and the jacket announces another issue next year for which sermons are being solicited from all quarters.

One can quickly satisfy a slight curiosity by noting the regional and denominational distribution of the selected sermons. They are not at all proportionate to the numerical size of the denominations represented, nor of the population of the various sections of the nation. While Roman Catholic and Jewish sermons are included, their numbers are not at all proportionate to the size of the membership of these faiths; the book is predominantly Protestant. One doubts, however, whether, if many of the contributions were not labelled by name, address, and imprimatur, the reader could tell what particular church or what part of the country was represented. The Foreword of the book offers the guess that five million sermons are preached annually in the United States. The present fifty-two are understood to be the cream of the cream — and reach a very high level, setting a pace for the other five million. Such a collection may have undoubted value if it does not tempt too many young Davids to try to put on Saul's armor.

There is something invidious in beginning to catalogue the fifty-two preachers when space forbids mention of all. But one notes on the first page of the contents such well-known names as Sockman, Buttrick, Norwood, Oxnam, and Sperry. In the main, the authors are pastors rather than pro-

fessional theologians, though a handful of theological seminary professors and one or two denominational executives break into the list. The editor has organized the fifty-two sermons under topics, hymn-book fashion, a device which this reviewer finds of doubtful value. However, it does enable one quickly to observe that only about one-tenth of the topics are definitely announced treatments of contemporary problems, while approximately another tenth represent anniversaries or occasions in the Christian year.

It should be expected that such a book will be studied as throwing light on successful sermonizing. Sermonic method, types of sermons, the relation of text to development, the nature of the Scriptural authority assumed behind the preaching, the use of illustrations — all these and many other points are worth careful analysis by ministers and professors of homiletics. But sermons are not composed for preachers or delivered to them. They represent the contemporary Gospel message as preached to congregations. How effective were they? What makes a particular sermon click with an individual? Or on a particular occasion? An inherent mystery remains at this point, and it is salutary to recall the Christian conception of all preaching, namely, that it is the word which the Spirit applies conveying truth which the people do not receive without faith.

H. P. D.

NOTE AND COMMENT

THE WORLD COUNCIL'S "PROCESS OF FORMATION" SUMMARIZED

YOU who read in our Summer issue Dr. Douglas Horton's condensed but vivid account of the meeting of the Provisional Committee of the World Council in Geneva in February would probably not have suspected that the minutes and accompanying data would necessitate a book of over two hundred pages. This, however, is the case. The full documentation of the occasion, together with a brief introduction by Visser 't Hooft, is now available from the American Committee of the World Council at \$1.50 per copy. All who wish to follow the continuity of thinking and action in the ecumenical movement will imperatively require this book as an essential link in the record.

CONTINUED NEGOTIATIONS FOR CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN AND EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH UNION

AT its June meeting the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches overwhelmingly adopted a report which reiterated its authorization to the Commission on Interchurch Relations and Christian Unity to attempt to work out a scheme of union with the Evangelical and Reformed Churches. It heard in lengthy detail the tangled problem of adjusting boards and other agencies involved in the union, and designated a special group to study particular relationships. It further authorized its Executive Committee, as soon as they are ready, to place the results of these and further studies by the Commission before the Churches with a request for an expression of opinion by associations and congregations. This action registers decisive progress in preparatory measures but delays final action. Discussions on the floor of the Council were almost entirely favorable to the union of the two groups. The presence throughout the Council of numerous "E and R" representatives gave opportunity for helpful and realistic exchanges of views as well as for the further strengthening of brotherly ties.

FURTHER APPROACHES TO UNION

THE Joint Commission of the Presbyterian, U.S.A. and the Protestant Episcopal Churches recently released a Proposed Basis of Union, the

text of which has appeared in current denominational publications. Their report will be considered by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church meeting in Philadelphia in September. It is accompanied by a minority report (signed by seven out of seventeen members of the Episcopal Commission) asking for the rejection of the Proposed Basis on the ground that it is disloyal to the Catholic heritage of that Church.

As to form, the action proposed is simply to submit the Basis to be studied by the subordinate units of the two Churches during the next two years. But the deeper issue whether any such terms as those proposed should be offered as a basis of further study and negotiation has taken on the character and aspects of a major battle within the Episcopal Church.

The Proposed Basis specifies that organic union is the goal of the negotiations. It includes a summary doctrinal statement, and gives interim recognition to the present doctrinal formulas of each of the Churches. As a scheme of government it sets up a series of graduated councils beginning with the local parish and ultimating in the General Assembly. Each council is composed of representatives of the next lower council, the laity of the congregations being represented exclusively by ruling elders.

The present ministers of either Church are to receive the authority of the other. Subsequently ordained ministers are to bear the authority of both traditions. An episcopate continuous with the historic office in the Protestant Episcopal Church is provided for, but the different historical views of the significance of the episcopate previously held in either Church are permitted. Union is to be consummated by a formal service of mutual recognition and the extension of authority to the ministers of the United Church; bishops and priests being commissioned by the laying on of hands by presbyters and vice versa. The formula to be used reads: "The ministry of the Word and Sacraments which thou hast already received is hereby recognized; and the grace and authority of Holy Orders as conferred by this Church are now added." The type of worship to which any congregation has been accustomed in the past according to the usage of either Church, may be continued, but a standing Liturgical Commission is created which is expected to develop a general norm of worship, ultimately to be embodied in a common service book.

The congregational element in the Church is not so explicitly recognized and provided for as in the Lausanne and Edinburgh formulations of the anticipated terms of general church union. It is rather lightly stressed that the laity share in the priesthood inherent in the Church, but the implementation of this concept exclusively follows a single direct line, namely the representation of the laity in all church councils by the ruling eldership. Viewing the present negotiations as a possible pattern for a still more inclusive American Church union, Churches of the congregational tradi-

tion may feel inclined to find here the creation of an extra and unanticipated barrier to what would be acceptable terms from their standpoint.

The minority of the Episcopal Commission formulates its chief objection as follows:

The Bishop has been transmuted simply into a permanent moderator. Any student of ecclesiastical institutions reading the present proposals impartially would come to only one conclusion, namely that our Church has ceased to preserve its historic identity and had become a new kind of Presbyterian Church.

On the contrary, the *Christian Century* (editorial of July 24, 1946), viewing the matter from the vantage point of an outsider, hails the proposed Basis of Union as an "inspired plan which reveals clearly how two dissimilar systems of church government can be united, with their weaknesses submerged and their strong points combined."

The Philadelphia General Convention is now confronted by the weighty responsibility of deciding whether or not to advance these proposals to the point of formal consideration by the Protestant Episcopal Church.

"HOLY IMPATIENCE" IN BEHALF OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

EXPRESSING what it called a "holy impatience" and a strong desire to forward the cause of Christian unity, the General Council of Congregational Christian Churches, meeting at Grinnell, Iowa in June, memorialized the Federal Council of Churches to call a representative council of American denominations "which already accord one another mutual recognition of ministries and sacraments," to consider the possibility of immediate closer unity. This action was based on the conviction that a unity now exists "deeper and more inclusive than has yet been expressed in outward life and organization." The memorial cites the urgency of the world situation as challenging the churches to unprecedented action. It carefully specifies that the intention is not to impair or delay any current unity efforts or negotiations.

According to the memorial, the Federal Council would merely act as convener of the proposed conference, which would consist of representatives appointed by such churches as might accept the invitation and would be plenary in the sense of determining its own procedures and limitations, defining the specific issues to be considered and the terms of any proposal which might result from this conciliar process. It is known that several other denominations are considering action in support of the proposal.

CHURCH UNION IN AUSTRALIA—A NEW APPROACH

IN the history of nations it has generally been found that the conditions shaping their social and political life have also vitally affected the pattern of their spiritual enterprises and ecclesiastical institutions. This is obviously true of Australia. When the first colony was established in 1788 it was intended that New South Wales should be merely a convict settlement. Australia, however, is a continent equal in area to the United States excluding Alaska and with a coast line of over 12,000 miles. In the first half of the nineteenth century free settlers began to arrive in great numbers and to establish themselves at long distances from Sydney and its bureaucratic government. These settlers demanded and ultimately secured the right of self-government. The result was that, in spite of good advice to the contrary, Australia was split up into six insulated states, each inclined to regard its neighbors with suspicion, if not dislike. When, however, European and Asiatic powers with policies of aggression began to infiltrate into the South Pacific it was realized by the states that it was high time for the policy of separation to give place to that of federation.

The Australian Commonwealth. After long years of acrimonious discussion the Commonwealth of Australia was formally inaugurated on January 1st, 1901. Under the Constitution the states retained their sovereign rights and residuary legislative power except in so far as their rights and power were transferred to the Federal Government. Under peace-time conditions the Commonwealth now controls such national concerns as defence, customs, immigration, old-age pensions, etc. The right of the states to legislate and to control their domestic affairs is not abrogated except in connection with matters exclusively under commonwealth control. While it cannot be contended that the Federal Constitution has worked with perfect smoothness, it marks at least a long step on the way to nationhood, and especially in the critical days of war it has enabled Australians to speak with one voice and to act with one will. No one claims that the present Constitution represents finality, but it is undoubtedly a great improvement on what went before, and there is in it "the promise and potency" of better things to come; for the power to amend the Constitution rests with the people as a whole.

The Story of the Churches. In their development the Australian churches have shared almost literally the experiences of the Australian states. When population began to expand along the coast and into the interior, local synods and assemblies were set up which in general conformed to state boundaries. In addition there were imported into the country many of the dissensions and disruptions that had racked the society of churches in older lands. It soon became apparent that in a new and sparsely settled

country many of those differences were irrelevant and even schismatic. Efforts, again covering a long and weary period, were made, especially by the leaders of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, to mend the breaches in their own walls and to achieve unity amongst their own separated members. In 1901 the Presbyterian Church of Australia was constituted and in 1904 the first meeting of the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australia was held. In each case the rights and privileges of the Churches of the several states were scrupulously safeguarded and the powers of their Supreme Courts were carefully defended and limited. The Presbyterians in particular made it plain that constitutional changes could be effected only with the approval of a substantial majority of the subordinate courts, on which the people were fully represented.

The First Union Movement, 1901-1924. Inspired by their success in achieving unity within their own ranks, Presbyterians and Methodists joined with representatives of other Churches, including Anglican and Baptist, with the object of promoting a more inclusive union. In the end, however, it was found that only the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational representatives felt themselves free to continue negotiations with a view to an incorporating union. After some years of negotiation, interrupted by the first World War, a Basis of Union which in its main provisions conformed to that adopted by the negotiating Churches in Canada was submitted to the Supreme Courts of the three Churches concerned. In each case the Basis was remitted to subordinate Courts and to congregations. Serious opposition developed only among the Presbyterians, but so strong and resolute was that opposition that the General Assembly of 1924, while declaring that there was no bar in principle to the union of the three churches, felt itself constrained to withdraw from the participation in the negotiations for an incorporating union. Thus the matter rested for nearly twenty years. Committees on Christian Unity still functioned feebly and in various fields. Plans for co-operation were prosecuted with more or less success, but the short cut to union visualized at the beginning of the century had become a closed road.

Federal Union. In 1938 conversations were re-opened between the three Churches, and in December, 1942 at a representative Conference held in Sydney it was resolved to recommend to these three Churches that they should re-open negotiations with a view to ultimate union and that they should enter into an engagement to continue such negotiations until that end had been secured, it being understood that the consummation of union should be reached only by agreements which would preserve within such union the continuity and historic witness of the contracting Churches. Since the date of this resolution the three negotiating Churches have declared themselves in favor of Federal Union as an alternative to an advisory Federal Council on the one side or a unified ecclesiastical organization on

the other side. At the present moment a Committee of the three churches is working out proposals which, as soon as possible, will be considered by the responsible Church Courts concerned.

It is proposed that the union to be effected will, in general, conform to the Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth. There will be no abatement of the powers and functions of existing State and Commonwealth Church Courts except in so far as they voluntarily surrender the control of certain departments of their work to a Federal Assembly, the authority of which will be voluntarily and loyally accepted by all the constituents of the Federal Union. At the outset the departments to be committed to the Federal authority would be restricted in number and would probably be concerned with the training of ministers and the extension of the mission enterprises of the Church at home and abroad. As experience and mutual confidence were increased the field for joint action might be extended indefinitely.

What of the Future? That the establishment of such a Federal Union presents many difficulties and will be bitterly resisted by those who are opposed to the whole idea of church union may be taken for granted. Similar difficulties, however, did not prevent the framing of the Commonwealth Constitution. Australia, throughout her history, has had her own distinctive problems, which she has had to approach from her own point of view. Her Federal Constitution represents her own attempt to strike a just balance between the rights of local governments in their relation to the central authority; and in advocating Federal Union many church leaders believe that they have found the safe middle way between the Scylla of segmentation and the Charybdis of regimentation. They believe that if their plan is adopted time and opportunity will be given for the co-operation and actual experience in joint enterprises that are always essential as preliminaries to a true incorporating union. This objective will be kept in view from the beginning but intimate working relationships between the Churches will not be conditioned by a preliminary agreement covering all the difficult problems of Faith and Order which have so often intensified existing differences instead of resolving them. A further advantage would be that complicated legal enactments relating to trusts and properties would not be necessary either now or when other Churches entered the union.

In spite of the fact that their history has been so largely one of division and dissension, Australians have shown that in great emergencies they are capable of closing their ranks and presenting to their enemies a united front. It now remains to be seen if in the present hour of crisis for the Christian way of life, Christ's followers in Australia are capable of mobilizing the resources of a united Church for the defence of the Gospel and the conquest of their land for the Kingdom of God.

JOHN MACKENZIE

LAYMEN IN THE WORLD COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

IN the light of the Symposium in our Summer number on representation in the World Council Assembly, a correspondent questions whether, with the limited number of seats provided by the Constitution and a possible upward limit of three or five seats for the largest Churches and only one seat each for many, there is any real likelihood that the proportion of laymen specified by the draft Constitution — one-third of the total number of representatives — could ever be reached. CHRISTENDOM invited Dr. Douglas Horton to reply to this very pertinent inquiry, which he has done as follows:

The comment is surely realistic in that it is statistically unlikely that the estimated proportion of laity in the Assembly of the World Council will ever be reached unless special measures are taken.

The World Council itself cannot decide how many laymen the several churches shall send to the Assembly. That would be an invasion of the autonomy of the several churches, many of which according to their doctrine and practices cannot depute to laymen sufficient authority to represent them.

Churches used to the leadership of both clergy and laity should regard it as their special duty and peculiar privilege to send lay representatives to the Assembly; some of them would appoint laymen to the number of one-half, many more to the number of one-third, of their delegations. It seems to me that the problem must be met and solved at this point.

The World Council itself might declare its approval of such a procedure in the communions in which it is entirely feasible.

A similar set of comments would apply to the representation of women in the Assembly.

Obviously the "consultation" which, according to the Constitution, is to suggest plans for achieving adequate lay representation, should come promptly and result in those "special measures" of which Dr. Horton speaks. Otherwise the Assembly is predestined to be more exclusively clerical than it is intended that it should be.

A CHURCH UNION NEARING CONSUMMATION

FINAL plans have been perfected for the uniting session of the Evangelical and United Brethren Churches to take place at Johnstown, Pa. in November. Both Churches are German in origin and Methodist in type. On the ground of their basic similarities they have long talked about union, active negotiations for which have been under way since 1933. Approving action permitting the consummation of union has now been secured from both bodies. The Evangelical Church has headquarters at

Harrisburg, Pa., the United Brethren at Dayton, Ohio. The merger will create a new Church, to bear the joint name, the Evangelical United Brethren, with nearly 700,000 members.

DR. CAVERT'S NEW TASK OF MEDIATION

DR. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, left early in July for Germany to act as Protestant liaison officer between the German churches and the American military government under a plan approved by President Truman. This arrangement will allow the German church leaders to present their problems to a wise and understanding American churchman, who will then interpret them to the army. Parallel appointments of Jewish and Catholic liaison officers have been made. Expressing his personal interest in the undertaking, President Truman, in a letter to Dr. Cavert, said: "It would seem to me that the revival of German religious life would greatly promote the Allied program for the development of democratic principles in Germany."

In addition to his liaison duties, Dr. Cavert has been appointed by the Chief of Chaplains, with the approval of the Secretary of War, to visit chaplains in the European Theatre of Operations. He will return to the United States in September.

INDEX, VOLUME XI (1946)

Articles

- Art and the Protestant Church, by Clarence Seidenspinner, 36.
- Background of the Hitler Plot, The, by George Kennedy Allen Bell, 65.
- Bishops, Priests, and Presbyters, by John Henderson Powell, Jr., 481.
- Christ Himself the Author of Unity, by W. A. Visser 't Hooft, 433.
- Christological Foundation of the World Council of Churches, The, by Clarence T. Craig, 13.
- Church of Christ in Japan Today, The, by Douglas Horton, 165.
- Church Press, The: Bulwark of Denominational Sovereignty, by R. W. Wolsey, 490.
- Community Church, The, by Roy A. Burkhart, 188.
- Cultural Pluralism in the American Tradition, by William W. Sweet.
- The Colonial Contribution, 316.
- Contributions from Northern and Western Europe, 501.
- Dynamics of Protestantism, The, by Wilhelm Pauck, 373.
- Ecumenical Rapprochement of American and German Protestantism, by Carl E. Schneider, 23.
- Ecumenical Testimony in Christian History, The, by John T. McNeill, 303.
- God As Idea and As Living, by Randolph Crump Miller, 57.
- Issues of Christian Unity, The, by Henry P. Van Dusen, 327.
- Limitations of the Church — Inherent and Accidental, by John C. Bennett, 2.
- Meeting of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, by Douglas Horton, 341.
- One Holy, Catholic Church, by Herbert W. Newell, 457.
- Philip Schaff the Liturgist, by Scott Francis Brenner, 443.
- Problems Facing German Protestantism, by Kristofer Hagen, 45.
- Prospect for the World Council, The, by Samuel McCrea Cavert, 226.
- Realization of Empirical Catholicity, The, by W. Norman Pittenger, 237.
- Religion and Morality, by W. Norman Pittenger, 509.
- Religious Liberty and the Andean Republics, by Paul Hoover Bowman, 213.
- Report of American to European Churches, A, by Walter Marshall Horton, 137.
- Retrospects and Prospects, by Willard L. Sperry, 199.
- Russian Orthodox Church at Home and Abroad, The, by E. R. Hardy, Jr., 153.
- Sectarian Theory of the Church, The, by Roland H. Bainton, 382.
- What the Army Taught Me about the Church, by Winston L. King, 462.
- Witness of the World Council of Churches, The, by W. A. Visser 't Hooft, 289.
- World Council Representation by Families of Churches, A Discussion by Floyd Tomkins, Franklin Clark Fry, Earl Frederick Adams, Ivan Lee Holt, and A. L. Warnshuis, 356.
- Youth and the Ecumenical Movement, by Robert S. Bilheimer, 175.
- Bennett, John C.: Limitations of the Church, Inherent and Accidental, 3.
- Bilheimer, Robert S.: Youth and the Ecumenical Movement, 175.
- Bowman, Paul Hoover: Religious Liberty and the Andean Republics, 213.
- Brenner, Scott Francis: Philip Schaff the Liturgist, 443.
- Burkhart, Roy A.: The Community Church, 188.
- Cavert, Samuel McCrea: The Prospect for the World Council, 226.
- Craig, Clarence T.: The Christological Foundation of the World Council of Churches, 13.
- Fry, Franklin Clark: World Council Representation by Families of Churches, 359.
- Hagen, Kristofer: Problems Facing German Protestantism, 45.
- Hardy, E. R., Jr.: The Russian Orthodox Church at Home and Abroad, 153.
- Holt, Ivan Lee: World Council Representation by Families of Churches, 366.
- Horton, Douglas: The Church of Christ in Japan Today, 165.
- Horton, Douglas: The Meeting of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, 341.
- Horton, Walter Marshall: A Report of American to European Churches, 137.
- King, Winston L.: What the Army Taught Me about the Church, 462.
- McNeill, John T.: The Ecumenical Testimony in Christian History, 303.
- Miller, Randolph Crump: God As Idea and As Living, 57.
- Newell, Herbert W.: One Holy, Catholic Church, 457.
- Pauck, Wilhelm: The Dynamics of Protestantism, 373.
- Pittenger, W. Norman: The Realization of Empirical Catholicity, 237.
- Pittenger, W. Norman: Religion and Morality, 509.
- Powell, John Henderson, Jr.: Bishops, Priests, and Presbyters, 481.
- Schneider, Carl E.: The Ecumenical Rapprochement of American and German Protestantism, 23.
- Seidenspinner, Clarence: Art and the Protestant Church, 36.
- Sperry, Willard L.: Retrospects and Prospects, 199.
- Sweet, William W.: Cultural Pluralism in the American Tradition: The Colonial Contribution, 316.
- Contributions from Northern and Central Europe, 501.
- Tomkins, Floyd: World Council Representation by Families of Churches, 356.
- Van Dusen, Henry P.: The Issues of Christian Unity, 327.
- Visser 't Hooft, W. A.: The Witness of the World Council of Churches, 289.
- Visser 't Hooft, W. A.: Christ Himself the Author of Unity, 433.
- Warnshuis, A. L.: World Council Representation by Families of Churches, 370.
- Wolsey, R. W.: The Church Press: Bulwark of Denominational Sovereignty, 490.

Books Reviewed

- Adams, Hampton: Calling Men for the Ministry, 284.
- Annihilation of Man, The, by Leslie Paul, 108.
- Apocryphal Literature, The, by Charles Cutler Torrey, 259.
- Asch, Sholem: One Destiny: An Epistle to the Christians, 245.
- Babson, Roger, and Zuver, Dudley: Can These Bones Live? 264.

Contributors of Articles

- Adams, Earl Frederick: World Council Representation by Families of Churches, 363.
- Bainton, Roland H.: The Sectarian Theory of the Church, 382.
- Bell, George Kennedy Allen: The Background of the Hitler Plot, 65.

- Baillie, John: What Is Christian Civilization? 253.
 Barclay, George: The Bible Speaks to Our Day, 99.
 Beaven, Robert H.: In Him Is Life, 396.
 Bell, Bernard Iddings: God Is Not Dead, 260.
 Best Sermons, 1946, edited by G. Paul Butler, 558.
 Beyond Personality, by C. S. Lewis, 95.
 Bible Speaks to Our Day, The, by George Barclay, 99.
 Book of Worship, The (Methodist), 254.
 Books of the Law, The, by Walter G. Williams, 416.
 Bower, William Clayton: The Living Bible, 413.
 Bowman, Rufus D.: Seventy Times Seven, 79.
 Brand, Blanshard: Philosophy in American Education, 83.
 Brandreth, H. R. T.: Unity and Reunion: A Bibliography, 112.
 Brightman, Edgar Sheffield: Nature and Values, 272.
 Bringing Our World Together, by Daniel J. Fleming, 80.
 Brown, William Adams: Toward a United Church, 515.
 Brunner, Emil: Justice and the Social Order, 418.
 Burn-Murdoch, H.: Church, Continuity and Unity, 104.
 Butler, G. Paul, ed.: Best Sermons, 1946, 558.
 Butler, J. Donald, 416.
 Calling Men for the Ministry, by Hampton Adams, 284.
 Calvinism, by Arthur Dakin, 555.
 Can These Bones Live? by Roger Babson and Dudley Zuver, 264.
 Casey, Robert Pierce: Religion in Russia, 424.
 Champion, Selwyn Gurney: The Eleven Religions and Their Proverbial Lore, 111.
 Chorley, E. Clowes: Men and Movements in the American Episcopal Church, 551.
 Christ and Divorce, by Felix L. Cirlot, 81.
 Christian Answer, The, ed., by H. P. Van Dusen, 97.
 Christian Future, The, by Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy, 421.
 Christian Global Strategy, A, by Walter W. Van Kirk, 271.
 Christianity and the Cultural Crisis, by Charles Duell Kean, 77.
 Christianity Rightly So Called, by Samuel G. Craig, 544.
 Christus und die Zeit, by Oscar Cullman, 391.
 Church Beautiful, The, by John R. Scotford, 408.
 Church, Continuity and Unity, by H. Burn-Murdoch, 104.
 Cirlot, Felix L.: Christ and Divorce, 81.
 Clark, Glenn, *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Coming Great Church, The, by Theodore O. Wedel, 249.
 Conkling, Wallace E., Priesthood in Action, 282.
 Craig, Samuel G.: Christianity Rightly So Called, 544.
 Cullman, Oscar: Christus und die Zeit, 391.
 Curran, Francis X.: Major Trends in American Church History, 551.
 Daily, Starr, *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Dakin, Arthur: Calvinism, 555.
 Davis, J. Merle: New Buildings on Old Foundations, 523.
 Deep Are the Roots, by Arnaud D'Usseau and James Gow, 423.
 Democratic Administration, by Ordway Tead, 89.
 Derrick, Michael: Eastern Catholics under Soviet Rule, 424.
 Dicks, Russell: Thy Health Shall Spring Forth, 257.
 Discerning the Signs of the Times, by Reinhold Niebuhr, 525.
 Doctors East, Doctors West, by Edward H. Hume, 420.
 Ducasse, Curt J.: Philosophy in American Education, 83.
 D'Usseau, Arnaud, with James Gow: Deep Are the Roots, 423.
 Eastern Catholics under Soviet Rule, by Michael Derrick, 424.
 Easton, W. Burnet, Jr.: The Faith of a Protestant, 396.
 Ecumenical Bibliography, An, ed. by Paul G. Macy, 112.
 Eddy, Sherwood: Pathfinders of the World Missionary Crusade, 277.
 Eleven Religions and Their Proverbial Lore, The, by Selwyn Gurney Champion, 111.
 Event in Eternity, by Paul Scherer, 269.
 Everyman's Religion, by Kenneth Mackenzie, 396.
 Experience Worketh Hope, by Arthur John Gossip, 99.
 Faith of a Protestant, The, by W. Burnet Easton Jr., 396.
 Fincher, Ernest R.: Puerto Rico: Unsolved Problems, 106.
 Finegan, Jack: Light from the Ancient Past, 398.
 First Epistle of St. Peter, The, by Edward Gordon Selwyn, 537.
 Fleming, Daniel J.: Bringing Our World Together, 80.
 Foundations for Reconstruction, by Elton Trueblood, 539.
 Fülöp-Miller, René: The Saints That Moved the World, 276.
 Gallagher, Buell G.: Portrait of a Pilgrim, 534.
 Garver, Earl K.: Puerto Rico: Unsolved Problems, 106.
 Gilkey, James Gordon: When Life Gets Hard, 410.
 Giordani, Igini: St. Paul: Apostle and Martyr, 407.
 Glueck, Nelson: The River Jordan, 425.
 God Is Not Dead, by Bernard Iddings Bell, 260.
 Gospel According to Gamaliel, The, by Gerald Heard, 274.
 Gossip, Arthur John: Experience Worketh Hope, 99.
 Gow, James, with Arnaud D'Usseau: Deep Are the Roots, 423.
 Grant, Frederick C.: The Practice of Religion, 394.
 Great Divorce, The, by C. S. Lewis, 552.
 Harding, Glenn, *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Hawkrigde, Emma: The Wisdom Tree, 111.
 Hayward, Percy R.: Young People's Prayers, 285.
 Heard, Gerald: The Gospel According to Gamaliel, 274.
 Hendel, Charles W.: Philosophy in American Education, 83.
 Hertz, Richard: Man on the Rock, 541.
 His Body the Church, by W. Norman Pittenger, 249.
 Hough, Lynn Harold: The Meaning of Human Experience, 262.
 How You Can Help Others, by Samuel M. Shoemaker, 257.
 Hume, Edward H.: Doctors East, Doctors West, 420.
 Hunter, Archibald M.: Introducing the New Testament, 536.
 Hutson, Harold H., with Donald W. Riddle: New Testament Life and Literature, 553.
 Huxley, Aldous: The Perennial Philosophy, 265.
 Idea of Christ in the Gospels or God in Man, The, A Critical Essay, by George Santayana, 546.
 In Him Is Life, by Robert H. Beaven, 396.
 Introducing the New Testament, by Archibald M. Hunter, 536.
 Jesus the Messiah, by William Manson, 520.
 Johnson, F. Ernest, editor: World Order: Its Intellectual and Cultural Foundation, 532.
 Johnson, Paul E.: Psychology of Religion, 73.
 Jones, E. Stanley, *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Jones, Rufus M., *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Judd, Walter, *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Justice and the Social Order, by Emil Brunner, 418.

- Kean, Charles Duell: Christianity and the Cultural Crisis, 77.
- Keeper of the Door, The, by George B. Sweazey, 411.
- Landsberger, Franz: Rembrandt, the Jews and the Bible, 557.
- Langford, Norman F.: The Two-Edged Sword, 75.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott: The United States Moves Across the Pacific, 427.
- Lauback, Frank, *et al.*, Together, 431.
- Let's Go Camping, by Raymond R. Peters, 110.
- Lewis, C. S.: Beyond Personality, 95.
- Lewis, C. S.: The Great Divorce, 552.
- Liebman, Joshua Loth: Peace of Mind, 542.
- Light from the Ancient Past, by Jack Finegan, 398.
- Light of Faith, The, by Albert W. Palmer, 286.
- Living Bible, The, by William Clayton Bower, 413.
- Longacre, Lindsay B.: The Old Testament: Its Form and Purpose, 417.
- Lowry, Charles W.: The Trinity and Christian Devotion, 548.
- Mackenzie, Kenneth: Everyman's Religion, 396.
- McKinney, Richard I.: Religion in Higher Education Among Negroes, 84.
- MacLeod, George: We Shall Rebuild, 279.
- Macy, Paul G., ed.: An Ecumenical Bibliography, 112.
- Magee, John G., *et al.*, Together, 431.
- Major Trends in American Church History, by Francis X. Curran, 551.
- Man on a Rock, by Richard Hertz, 541.
- Manson, William: Jesus the Messiah, 520.
- Manual of Eastern Orthodox Prayers, 285.
- Meaning of Human Experience, The, by Lynn Harold Hough, 262.
- Men and Movements in the American Episcopal Church, by E. Clowes Chorley, 551.
- Midnight Cry, The, by Francis D. Nichol, 103.
- Moon, Bucklin, ed.: Primer for White Folks, 100.
- Morse, Hermann N.: These Moving Times, 102.
- Mosely, J. Rufus, *et al.*, Together, 431.
- Mother of Carmel, by E. Allison Peers, 530.
- Murphy, Arthur E.: Philosophy in American Education, 83.
- My Father Worketh Hitherto, by Eric H. Wahlstrom, 404.
- Nature and Purpose of the Gospel, The, by R. V. G. Tasker, 270.
- Nature and Values, by Edgar Sheffield Brightman, 272.
- Nelson, John Oliver, ed.: We Have This Ministry, 429.
- Nelson, Lawrence E.: Our Roving Bible, 556.
- New Buildings on Old Foundations, by J. Merle Davis, 523.
- New Education and Religion, The, by J. Paul Williams, 85.
- New Modernism, The, by Cornelius Van Til, 528.
- New Testament Life and Literature, by Donald W. Riddle and Harold H. Hutson, 553.
- New Testament Theology, by Ethelbert Stauffer, 518.
- Nichol, Francis D.: The Midnight Cry, 103.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold: Discerning the Signs of the Times, 525.
- Old Testament, The: Its Form and Purpose, by Lindsay B. Longacre, 417.
- One Destiny: An Epistle to the Christians, by Sholem Asch, 245.
- One Kind of Religion, by Helen Wodehouse, 93.
- One World in the Making, by Ralph Barton Perry, 280.
- Otto, Max C.: Philosophy in American Education, 83.
- Our Roving Bible, by Lawrence E. Nelson, 556.
- Palmer, Albert W.: The Light of Faith, 286.
- Pathfinders of the World Missionary Crusade, by Sherwood Eddy, 277.
- Paul, Leslie: The Annihilation of Man, 108.
- Peace of Mind, by Joshua Loth Liebman, 542.
- Peers, E. Allison: Mother of Carmel, 530.
- Perennial Philosophy, The, by Aldous Huxley, 265.
- Perry, Ralph Barton: One World in the Making, 280.
- Peters, Raymond R.: Let's Go Camping, 110.
- Philosophy in American Education: Its Tasks and Responsibilities, by Brand Blanshard, Curt J. Ducasse, Charles E. Hendel, Arthur E. Murphy, Max C. Otto, 83.
- Pioneers of Tomorrow: A Call to American Youth, by Hans Weil, 96.
- Pittenger, W. Norman: His Body the Church, 249.
- Portrait of a Pilgrim, by Buell G. Gallagher, 534.
- Practice of Religion, The, by Frederick C. Grant, 394.
- Priesthood in Action, by Wallace E. Conkling, 282.
- Primer for White Folks, ed. by Bucklin Moon, 100.
- Psychology of Religion, by Paul E. Johnson, 73.
- Puerto Rico: Unsolved Problems, by Earl K. Garver and Ernest B. Fincher, 106.
- Readings in St. John's Gospel, by William Temple, 90.
- Religion in America, by Willard L. Sperry, 516.
- Religion in Higher Education Among Negroes, by Richard I. McKinney, 84.
- Religion in Russia, by Robert Pierce Casey, 424.
- Rembrandt, the Jews and the Bible, by Franz Landsberger, 557.
- Revised New Testament, The, 388.
- Riddle, Donald W., with Harold H. Hutson: New Testament Life and Literature, 553.
- River Jordan, The, by Nelson Glueck, 425.
- Robinson, William: The Shattered Cross, 283.
- Romanism and the Gospel, by C. Anderson Scott, 400.
- Rosenstock-Huussy, Eugen: The Christian Future, 421.
- St. Paul: Apostle and Martyr, by Igino Giordani, 407.
- Saints That Moved the World, The, by René Fülöp-Miller, 276.
- Santayana, George: Idea of Christ in the Gospels or God in Man, The. A Critical Essay, 546.
- Scherer, Paul: Event in Eternity, 269.
- Schroyer, Montgomery J.: The Synoptic Gospels, 414.
- Scotford, John R.: The Church Beautiful, 408.
- Scott, C. Anderson: Romanism and the Gospel, 400.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon: The First Epistle of St. Peter, 537.
- Seventy Times Seven, by Rufus D. Bowman, 79.
- Shattered Cross, The, by William Robinson, 283.
- Shoemaker, Samuel M.: How You Can Help Others, 257.
- Shoemaker, Samuel M. *et al.*, Together, 431.
- Significance of Silence, The, by Leslie D. Weatherhead, 411.
- Smart, W. A.: The Spiritual Gospel, 535.
- Smith, Wilbur M.: Therefore Stand, 107.
- Sperry, Willard L.: Those of the Way, 268, Religion in America, 516.
- Spiritual Gospel, The, by W. A. Smart, 535.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert: New Testament Theology, 518.
- Straton, Hillyer H.: Thinking Where Jesus Thought, 75.
- Sweazey, George E.: The Keeper of the Door, 411.
- Synoptic Gospels, The, by Montgomery J. Shroyer, 414.
- Tasker, R. V. G.: The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, 270.
- Teard, Orday: Democratic Administration, 89.
- Temple, William: Readings in St. John's Gospel, 90.
- Therefore Stand, by Wilbur M. Smith, 107.
- These Moving Times, by Hermann N. Morse, 102.
- Thinking Where Jesus Thought, by Hillyer H. Straton, 75.
- Those of the Way, by Willard L. Sperry, 268.

- Thurman, Howard, *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Thy Health Shall Spring Forth, by Russell Dicks, 257.
 Together, by Rufus M. Jones, Frank Lauback, J. Rufus Moseley, E. Stanley Jones, Glenn Clark, Walter Judd, John G. Magee, Samuel H. Shoemaker, Starr Daily, Abraham Vereide, Glenn Harding, Howard Thurman, 431.
 Torrey, Charles Cutler: The Apocryphal Literature, 259.
 Toward a United Church, by William Adams Brown, 515.
 Treatise of St. Athanasius, The, 405.
 Trinity and Christian Devotion, The, by Charles W. Lowry, 548.
 Trueblood, Elton: Foundations for Reconstruction, 539.
 Two-Edged Sword, The, by Norman F. Langford, 75.
 United States Moves Across the Pacific, The, by Kenneth Scott Latourette, 427.
 Unity and Reunion: A Bibliography, by H. R. T. Brandreth, 112.
 Van Dusen, H. P., ed.: The Christian Answer, 97.
 Van Kirk, Walter W., A Christian Global Strategy, 271.
 Van Til, Cornelius: The New Modernism, 528.
 Vereide, Abraham, *et al.*, Together, 431.
 Wahlstrom, Eric H.: My Father Worketh Hitherto, 404.
 Weatherhead, Leslie D.: The Significance of Silence, 411.
 Wedel, Theodore O.: The Coming Great Church, 249.
 We Have This Ministry, edited by John Oliver Nelson, 429.
 Weil, Hans: Pioneers of Tomorrow: A Call to American Youth, 96.
 We Shall Rebuild, by George MacLeod, 279.
 What Is Christian Civilization, by John Baillie, 253.
 When Life Gets Hard, by James Gordon Gilkey, 410.
 Williams, J. Paul: The New Education and Religion, 85.
 Williams, Walter G.: The Books of the Law, 416.
 Wisdom Tree, The, by Emma Hawkrige, 111.
 Wodehouse, Helen: One Kind of Religion, 93.
 World Order: Its Intellectual and Cultural Foundation, edited by F. Ernest Johnson, 532.
 Young People's Prayers, by Percy R. Hayward, 285.
 Zuver, Dudley and Babson, Roger: Can These Bones Live? 264.
 Greene, Phillips F., 420.
 Haines, Elwood L., 410.
 Hamilton, Clarence H., 277.
 Hamilton, Samuel L., 85.
 Hardy, E. R., Jr., 424.
 Harkness, Georgia, 257.
 Harner, Nevin C., 413.
 Hartman, Grover L., 79.
 Heller, Bernard, 542.
 Hiltner, Seward, 73.
 Holt, Ivan Lee, 271.
 Homrighausen, Elmer G., 75, 268.
 Horton, Walter Marshall, 391.
 Hough, Lynn Harold, 99, 421.
 Jeffery, Arthur, 398.
 Johnson, F. Ernest, 418.
 Kerr, Hugh Thomson, Jr., 107.
 Keys, William, 96.
 Knudson, Albert C., 272.
 Kuntz, Paul Grimley, 551.
 Lehmann, Paul, 528.
 Leiper, Henry Smith, 245, 515.
 McCown, C. C., 259.
 Mays, Benjamin E., 84.
 Meyer, Ernst W., 541.
 Minear, Paul S., 537.
 Muelder, Walter G., 396.
 Nixon, Justin Wroe, 539.
 Noyes, Morgan Phelps, 260.
 Parsons, Edward L., 90.
 Pielstick, Don F., 110.
 Pittenger, W. Norman, 104.
 Pope, Liston, 77.
 Poteat, Edwin McNiell, 95.
 Reed, Luther D., 254.
 Richards, George W., 405, 544.
 Roberts, W. Glenn, 552.
 Sanderson, Ross W., 279, 534.
 Schroeder, John C., 282, 556.
 Schubert, Paul, 414.
 Seitz, Oscar J. F., 81.
 Shurtleff, Isabel B., 102.
 Sperry, Willard L., 394, 546.
 Steere, Douglas, 530.
 Storey, Helen, 264.
 Sweet, William W., 103, 516.
 Swift, Arthur L., Jr., 89, 523.
 Taylor, Henry Milton, 262.
 Trueblood, D. Elton, 108.
 Wedel, T. O., 400.
 White, Hugh Vernon, 404.
 Wilder, Amos N., 274, 518.
 Wygal, Winifred, 93.

Reviewers

- Abernethy, Bradford S., 100, 423.
 Applegarth, Margaret T., 80.
 Bainton, Roland H., 276.
 Baxter, Edna May, 536.
 Bennett, John C., 253.
 Bosley, Harold, 265, 525.
 Bowman, John W., 388.
 Boynton, Edward C., 403.
 Braden, Charles S., 427.
 Brightman, Edgar Sheffield, 83.
 Brown, Earl R., 106.
 Butler, J. Donald, 416.
 Coffin, Henry Sloan, 249.
 Craig, Clarence T., 535.
 Dabney, Vaughan, 411.
 Devan, S. Arthur, 408.
 Douglass, H. Paul, 111, 283, 284, 285, 286, 429, 431, 548, 555.
 Fagley, Richard M., 280, 532.
 Ferré, Nels F. S., 97.
 Filson, Floyd V., 407.
 Foster, Lloyd Ellis, 269.
 Grant, Frederick C., 270, 520.
 Grant, Robert M., 553.

Liturgy and Verse

- A Eucharistic Prayer, by Philip Schaff, 187.
 Ancient Christmas Greetings, by Gerhard Friedrich, 1.
 Friedrich, Gerhard: Ancient Christmas Greetings, 1.
 Geren, Paul: A Litany of Despair and Praise, 475.
 Litany of Despair and Praise, A., by Paul Geren, 475.
 Schaff, Philip: A Eucharistic Prayer, 187.

Contributed Note and Comment

- Abbott, Gordon: Church Union in South Africa, 118.
 MacKenzie, John: Church Union in Australia, 563.
 Report of Delegation from the World Council, 128.

Documents

- A Growing Fellowship: Excerpts from Annual Report of W. A. Visser 't Hooft, 114.

Recommended by Religious Book Club

ROAD TO REFORMATION

by BOEHMER

Translated from German writing of Boehmer by John W. Doberstein and Theodore G. Tappert

New Light On Young Luther — Pastors and theologians who have responded to the recent revival of research on Luther now have access to the thinking and writings of one of the foremost contemporary church historians — the successor to the great Albert Hauck, under whom he studied. ROAD TO REFORMATION is a biography of Luther from monkhood, through priesthood to the Diet of Worms. With remarkable clearness, simplicity and exactness the translators have drawn the author's original picture in proper perspective. Choice old legends about Luther's early life have been ruthlessly shattered. Boehmer shows how Luther was in many points not a persistent Occamist, nor a product of German mysticism. ROAD TO REFORMATION is scholarly, fascinating and factual. A real contribution to one's understanding of the founder of Protestantism. Cloth bound. 448 pages.

\$4

M U H L E N B E R G P R E S S

1228 Spruce Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

CHRISTENDOM'S NEW YEAR

The Winter Number Begins Volume XII

The year 1947 promises to be crucial for ecumenical thinking, organization, and decisions both locally, nationally and on the world-stage.

CHRISTENDOM will continue to record and interpret and hopes sometimes to influence these developments.

Among our distinguished contributors to the Winter Number are:

ROGER HAZELTON

Is a Christian Philosophy Possible?

A criticism of recent theories which deny any intelligent order in God's ways with men.

H. SHELTON SMITH

Orthodoxy and Neo-orthodoxy

Their affinities and differences.

R. W. ALBRIGHT

A New United Church

The story of the current unification of two American denominations.

W. EDGAR GREGORY

Between the Devil and the Deep Sea

An ex-chaplain's reflections on the role of religion in aggravating and removing neurotic tensions in soldiers.

NEW YORK CITY 10

\$3.00 a Year

297 Fourth Avenue

\$1.00 a Copy